

THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 1.

FEBRUARY, 1890.

No. 5.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

SHOULD CHURCH PROPERTY BE TAXED?

BY HENRY C. VEDDER, ASSOCIATE EDITOR OF *The Examiner*, NEW YORK CITY.

THE advisability and justice of exempting from taxation property owned by religious corporations has lately been called in question by several of the religious denominations of Canada, notably by the Baptists at the recent meeting of their convention in Toronto. The occasion of the present discussion was the passage in Quebec of the Jesuits' Estates Bill, by which a gift of \$400,000 was made direct from the treasury as compensation for the confiscation of Jesuit property in the year 1791. It is probable that the consciences of Canadian Protestants would not have been so preternaturally quickened, except for the circumstance that their Catholic opponents profited by this gift. Large numbers of educational and charitable institutions in Canada, under Protestant control, have received gifts amounting in the aggregate to many millions of dollars, without arousing such protest. Doubtless there have been some who have looked with disapproval upon all such appropriations of public funds to purposes private and more or less sectarian. But it is a somewhat curious circumstance that their consciences have never before compelled them to make so public and determined a protest against this vestige of union between Church and State. The present protest, indeed, lacks one element of justification that might have existed in former instances, for the reason that this payment to the Jesuits was avowedly, and, so far as we can judge, really, in some sense the fulfilment of a moral obligation. When the government of George III. forcibly confiscated the property of Canadian Jesuits, it acted without the shadow of moral right. It avowed and proceeded upon

but when a sovereign power does this to its subjects it is called a stroke of statecraft. There seems to be no good reason, however, why the sovereign power that has thus stolen the property of its subjects, if in process of time the conscience of rulers should become enlightened, is not entitled and even obligated to make at least a partial restitution; and it seems hardly consistent for those who profess to be, above other men, zealous for truth and righteousness, to denounce this tardy honesty as a violation of civil and religious liberty.

The connection, therefore, does not seem to be close, either in morals or in logic, between the Jesuits' Estates Bill and the question of exempting church property from taxation. Nevertheless, it is a fact that rage caused by the one is at the bottom of the agitation against the other. Prejudice and passion are not likely to be logical. This defect has shorn of moral power many of the protests that our friends across the border have made against the principle of exempting church property from taxation. Nevertheless, let the protests have whatsoever weight seems fairly to belong to them. The resolution adopted by the Canadian Baptist Convention is as follows:

Whereas, the historic belief of the Baptist Church has always been that Church and State should be separate, and that all citizens and denominations should be equal in every way before the law; and,

Whereas, the said principle is being violated in all ecclesiastical conventions, whether in favor of the Baptists or of other denominations, in continuance of the mediæval tithing system of the Roman Catholic denomination in Quebec, in the existence of separate schools, supported out of public rates, in State provision for religious instruction in public schools, and in public grants for denominational purposes, as well as in other respects; . . .

Resolved, that we hereby declare our conviction that the only permanent and sufficient remedy for these evils that are subversive of the principles of religious liberty and equality, and therefore a hindrance in the development of our national life, is the absolute and final separation of Church and

"The good old plan,
That they should get who have the power,
And they should keep who can."

When John Doe does this to Richard Roe,
we call it stealing and we put John in prison,

State and a revision of our constitution in harmony with the same.

It will be seen that this preamble and resolution classes together several things that are easily separable in principle and practice. They are not only separable, but they are actually separated in the United States. For example, the Federal and most of the State constitutions contain clauses prohibiting the appropriation of money from the public treasury for the maintenance of sectarian or denominational schools, as well as all other grants for denominational purposes. In no State in the Union has there been even a trace of a tithing system since Massachusetts, in 1833, abolished the last remnant of a State Church. No citizen of the United States would support any proposition for using moneys raised by general taxation for any private enterprises, either religious or secular. The question at issue between those who approve and those who disapprove of the exemption of church property from taxation should be distinctly defined. It is not, Shall ministers be taxed? It is not, Are the present laws relating to taxation of church property wholly just and defensible? It is not whether property held by religious corporations for purposes of revenue should be taxed. It is not even whether property held by Christian organizations only should be taxed. The real question is, whether it is good public policy, and whether the principle of complete religious liberty and separation between Church and State requires, that property should be taxed which is used exclusively for purposes of religious worship. Whether this property is a Christian church, a Mohammedan mosque or a Chinese joss house, the State need not concern itself. The theory of religious liberty requires it to treat all religions alike. Using the term "church property" in this broad sense, the inquiry properly is whether its exemption from taxation is justifiable. This restriction of the question would clip the wings of many a soaring oration that has been delivered of late, but no one need shed tears over the loss. A little less eloquence and a little more hard sense would contribute much to the solution of this vexed question. The real point at issue has been stated, and all other questions are interlopers that we may bow out with scant ceremony.

Much pretentious nonsense has been spoken and written on this question through lack of a clear conception and a precise use of the terms employed. The majority of fierce debates will be found, on close analysis, to be a wrangle over words that the disputants

use in different senses. In debating this question, men have spoken of the State as if it were some mysterious power, a Spencerian Unknowable, whose ways were past finding out, whose fiats were as inexorable as those of the three weird sisters of mythology. A tax has been vaguely declaimed against as if it were some merciless engine for squeezing money out of people. *L'état, c'est moi*, said Louis XIV., summing up the whole theory of absolute monarchy in this phrase; *the State is the people* is a paraphrase that sums up the theory of democracy. Or, more precisely, the State is the people organized, through their chosen representatives engaging in self-government. The theory of the British Constitution is, that the Parliament is the people of England, not constructively but actually, and that theory lies at the base of our American governments. A tax is simply a sum assessed upon the people by themselves to defray the expenses of government. When, therefore, we translate into plain English the question, Shall the State tax church property? we simply mean, Is it necessary that the people should assess a contribution for governmental expenses upon property used for religious purposes?

It is plain that those who argue against the remission of taxes from church property, on the ground that to remit a tax is precisely the same in principle as to make a direct grant of money from the Treasury, cannot possibly maintain their ground. To make grants of money in favor of a single religious body is evidently to violate the American theory that all religious bodies are to stand on the same footing before the law. Legislation in favor of the Church by the State is repugnant to the entire American theory of Government. The American State, in fact, does not recognize the Church as such. It treats religious and secular associations of persons, bound together by a common aim, in precisely the same way. That is to say, any number of persons who desire to associate themselves for any sort of lawful purpose, whether social amusement, moral elevation, or religious worship, are permitted to incorporate themselves, and, as a corporation, may hold property and exercise other legal rights. No distinction is made in principle between associations for religious purposes and associations for purely secular purposes. All such voluntary associations being thus treated alike, as to their fundamental purpose, they should also be treated on the same principles by the State in the matter of taxation. If it can be shown that such is the case, that religious corporations receive from

the State no favors not granted to other corporations for similar reasons, it will follow that there is no moral or legal objection to the exemption from taxation of church property.

The first right of any people is to secure their own well being. Any measures necessary to secure this, so they do not violate fundamental moral law, are justifiable. It is in pursuance of this principle that governments are organized for the protection of life and property, and the laying of taxes for the support of Government must follow this general principle. The working out of this general law of taxation by Adam Smith in his *Wealth of Nations* has received little addition from subsequent economists. Of his four maxims, or principles, with which nearly all subsequent writers concur, the first is the most important: "The subjects of every State ought to contribute to the support of the Government, as nearly as possible, in proportion to their respective abilities—that is, in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy under the protection of the State. In the observation or neglect of this maxim consists what is called the equality or inequality of taxation." The late Professor Fawcett preferred to state the principle thus: "The aggregate amount which each individual pays in taxes ought to be in proportion to his ability to contribute to the revenue of the State." This statement differs from that of Smith, only in providing more carefully that legislators in levying taxes should be more cautious than they sometimes are not to have the incidence of taxation fall with more weight upon a single class than upon other classes in the community. But the general principle is accepted by all authorities, that the burdens of Government should be imposed, so far as may be, equally upon all, heavily upon none. It follows, therefore, that not all persons, and not all kinds of property can be equitably taxed alike, since all do not enjoy an equal revenue, and so are not equally able to contribute to the expenses of the State.

This fundamental law of taxation is sometimes disputed by certain writers who hold that Government exists mainly, if not solely, for protection of life and property; that taxation is the price paid for protection, and that all therefore ought to be taxed alike, in proportion to the protection received. It is evident that this theory is absurd. If it were true, then women and children ought to be taxed more heavily than adult men, since they need and receive a greater measure of protection from the State.

According to this theory, insane persons, and those of feeble mind, should be the most heavily taxed class in the community. Moreover, as life no less than property is protected, according to this theory of taxation a poll-tax should be levied upon every member of the community, infants included, for the protection received. Truly these be fine conclusions, and we may follow the example of Fawcett in dismissing the theory which requires them "as scarcely worthy of serious consideration."

From the general principle that taxation is to be graduated according to ability to pay, may be deduced the principles according to which property may be exempted from taxation. The right of exemption, like the right of taxing, rests upon the one basis of the common weal of the people. It can rest on no other basis. Following out this general law, economists have laid down some general principles of exemption, substantially as follows:

First. The State need tax only so much property as is necessary to raise the amount of revenue needed for governmental expenses. As a matter of fact, no government taxes all property. The most ardent admirer of our American tariff probably never contended that Congress ought to lay a uniform tax of, say, twenty-five per cent *ad valorem*, on every article imported into the United States. There always has been, and always will be, a large free list, which will fluctuate from time to time according to the view of the majority that happens to prevail in Congress, without at all losing its essential character. In the State of New York there is at present a very active agitation, though confined to a body just now numerically small, in favor of reducing all State taxes to a single tax upon land. Men advocate this on the ground that such a tax is more easily levied and collected than any other; and maintain that what is known among economists as the incidence or repercussion of taxation will in the end secure the placing of this burden equally upon all. As a matter of fact, therefore, as well as of principle, the State does, and must, exempt much property from taxation, and might exempt much more without violating any right.

Secondly. The State may, and should, exempt property from taxation when a tax would overburden it. A tax that is overburdensome is contrary to the fundamental principle of contribution according to the ability to pay; hence, all essentially unproductive property may properly be exempted from taxation on the ground that to tax it

would be overburdensome. In the long run the State would injure, not benefit, itself by a tax on such property. It would lay the burden of government, not upon those best able, but upon those least able, to bear it. It does not follow, however, that because essentially unproductive property may be exempted from taxation, no unproductive property should be taxed—far from it. Men or corporations, who hold property for their personal advantage, may fairly be presumed to reap profit from it—if not an actual, then a prospective profit. The contrary may, by some misfortune, be the fact, for, of course, it is not every business transaction that yields the expected profit. The State is right, however, in assuming that all property is potentially productive, and in proceeding to tax it on this presumption, unless the contrary distinctly appears to be the case. In a few instances, injustice will doubtless be done, but no general laws can be devised that would be absolutely just in their operation. The principle is sound, even if its practical effect is here and there oppressive. But the case is quite otherwise when men or corporations are found to hold property for other purposes than revenue—purposes that absolutely preclude the possibility of pecuniary profit to its owners; purposes that render it essentially unproductive; then the State may, and should, exempt it from taxation. If, for example, men of wealth in New York desire to establish a hospital for the free treatment of all classes, or to found an asylum for the insane or the blind or the aged, and if they should lavish their wealth upon the purchase of suitable grounds, and the erection of handsome buildings, is it for the interest of the whole people that they should be taxed for the privilege of thus gratifying their benevolent impulses? No, answers common sense. No, answers every economist. No, answers every civilized government under heaven. No, answers every right Christian impulse. Yes, answer a few enthusiasts, all property should be taxed.

Thirdly. The State may exempt from taxation any class of property when such exemption would encourage enterprises profitable to the State, and not likely otherwise to be undertaken, or, if undertaken, to prove successful. This may seem, at first blush, inconsistent with the principle of equality in taxation, but the seeming conflict is a conflict only in seeming. The justification of a tax, we have seen, consists solely in its tendency to promote the common weal; but it not infrequently happens that the welfare of all is best subserved by the

exemption from taxation of certain classes of property, that are more or less exclusively devoted to the promotion of the good of all citizens. The sole question to be answered, in any given case where a claim is made for exemption, is, whether the enterprise in question is directly or indirectly beneficial to the people at large. If it is beneficial only to a part of the people, exemption would amount, in fact, to the taxing of one class for the benefit of another, which is admittedly indefensible.

Fourthly. The State may, and in fact does, exempt from taxation all property held for the public use and advantage. Public parks, buildings, highways, etc., are exempt under this principle. It would be absurd for the people to tax themselves for the privilege of having those things necessary to the convenience of all. The very existence of these things is in itself a tax. Every highway and park is just so much land thrown out of cultivation. Every building is erected with money taken from the people's pockets. To tax a tax would be an absurdity that could be seriously entertained only in Bedlam.

The question narrows itself, therefore, to the application of these general principles of exemption to the specific case of church property. Some have held that the exemption of church property can be justified under the first principle. They urge that the State can raise a revenue for its support without taxing such property, and therefore may properly exempt it. This contention, though plausible, will not bear examination, for the same argument might be urged in favor of exempting all other classes of property *seriatim*, and the strictly logical but highly absurd conclusion therefore would be that no property at all should be taxed. But the State must tax some property, and if church property is to plead exemption, it must show adequate cause.

A better case, however, is made for the exemption of church property under the second principle—that is to say, that a tax laid upon this species of property would overburden it. This does not necessarily imply that it would destroy churches, although doubtless in cases not a few the additional burden of a tax would make all the difference between life and death. It does not even mean that the tax would cripple the churches, though it doubtless would cripple many. What it means is that by such a tax a greatly disproportionate burden would be laid on church property, which would, *ipso facto*, as compared with other property, be *over* burdened. Church prop-

erty is essentially unproductive—unproductive, that is to say, in the economic sense. It is unproductive in just the same manner as hospitals and asylums are unproductive, and therefore, like them, it may and should be exempt from taxation.

It is sometimes objected to this conclusion that, although religious proprietors do not derive a pecuniary revenue from their property, they receive a moral revenue that is quite as valuable, and hence that their property cannot be called unproductive. This is evidently mere word-jugglery. Tax and revenue are economic terms. Political economy takes cognizance only of values that can be expressed in dollars and cents. Financiers have never devised a scheme for taxing the pleasure that a man derives from the ownership of a fine picture or statue, the mental sharpening that he gains from a good book, or the moral impulse that comes from the hearing of a good sermon. To tax things like these would be like the project once so popular in Laputa, to extract sunbeams from cucumbers. Like other ingenious devices of which Gulliver brought report from that remarkable country, it would be hardly practicable among us.

Church property may be exempted from taxation under the third principle recognized by economists, because the existence and prosperity of religious societies are profitable to the State. By religious societies is not meant Christian bodies alone, but all religious bodies. Gibbon tells us that there was a time in the later history of Rome when all religions were looked upon by the people as equally true, by the philosophers as equally false, and by the emperors as equally expedient. To some extent the modern State agrees with the Roman emperor. With few exceptions, all religious bodies teach a sound practical morality. It is well known that the moral maxims of Mohammed, of Buddha, and of Confucius are substantially identical with the decalogue. Any religion, from the statesman's point of view, is better than no religion, because religion of whatever kind adds to morality incentives and sanctions, and tends to secure right conduct. The proposition is not to be doubted that the existence of any religious society is beneficial to the State, by the mere fact that its teachings enforce morality and restrain vice, crime, and pauperism. This is true more especially of Christianity, which, whether it is believed or rejected as a dogmatic system, is admitted to teach the purest system of morals that mankind has known.

Every economist and publicist will tell us that the chief burden of government

arises from the necessity of preventing, detecting, and punishing crime. If the sphere of government could be confined to the one aim of promoting the general welfare of the people, by undertaking such enterprises as individual or corporate effort could not carry out, the cost of administration would be a *bagatelle* compared with what it now is. To maintain courts, to pay police, to build, equip and support prisons, constitutes the heaviest part of the burden of government. If to this be added the cost of pauperism to the community, we have probably seventy-five per cent of our present expenses accounted for, the stealings of dishonest officials being always excepted. Take away crime and pauperism and the expenses of government would not be more than one-fourth of their present amount. Now every religious society, by whatsoever name it is known, might be called "A Society for the Prevention of Crime and Pauperism." It is obviously for the interests of the State, the organized body of the people, by every means in its power to encourage the formation of such societies. It would be to frustrate the objects of government, if the State were to lay a heavy burden on enterprises so profitable, so indispensable, to it. It is often admitted, in fact, by those more or less hostile to the churches, that this line of argument would hold good if the Christian churches were actually what they are in theory. It is maintained, however, that the average church, at least of Protestant denominations, is a social club; that church buildings are religious club-houses, fitted up and supported for the social and spiritual delectation of their owners; and that the public in general are not only not desired to partake of these advantages, but are in practice rigorously excluded. There are, perhaps, a few ultra-fashionable churches of which this may be said with some approach to truth. It is a caricature, however, of the average Christian church, which maintains a costly property, often by dint of great self-sacrifice, and asks nothing better than that the general public will share the use of it.

It is urged that the taxation of church property would tend to repress extravagance in building magnificent temples, and check the desire for show, which is doing so much to alienate the masses from Christianity. This extravagance has the result, we are assured, of making churches select institutions, attendance at which is accompanied by so many expenses as to be beyond the means of ordinary people. Men would be slow, it is added, to invest a half million dollars in a splendid church, if they knew

that so doing would involve them in a heavy annual taxation. It is admitted on all hands that the extirpation of religious pride were a consummation devoutly to be wished. It may be a question, however, whether it is not too deeply rooted in our sinful human nature to be eradicated by any short and easy method like this. The fact that a church is able to build a magnificent edifice usually warrants the conclusion that it would be able to pay taxes on it also if necessary. A church of millionaires would have just as imposing an edifice, just as lofty a steeple, just as elaborate carving and decorations, if taxed, as if untaxed. It would be the poor church, already staggering under its financial burdens, that would be seriously affected by taxation. Besides, this argument is two-edged. Do not those who urge it comprehend that taxation would only increase the expenses of churches, make attendance more difficult than ever, and so widen the breach between the masses and Christianity the existence of which they so deeply (and no doubt so sincerely) lament? It is to be considered, moreover, that the richer churches, which now give largely to benevolent objects, and establish missions at home and abroad, would inevitably be compelled to diminish both the scope and the amount of their contributions. We are most vehemently assured that taxation will prove a blessing in disguise to the churches, but it would be so thoroughly disguised that few eyes would be sharp enough to discover the blessing. For the State, it would certainly be a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy.

Under the fourth principle, also, church property may be exempted from taxation, on the ground that it is held for the public use and advantage. If it is objected that this cannot be the case, because the title to it is held by corporations and that it thus becomes private property, it may be replied that cemeteries, libraries, museums, hospitals, and many other similar institutions are also controlled by corporations, but are generally regarded as public property, notwithstanding. Every building maintained by religious societies is maintained, not for its own use merely, but for the public use. To use these buildings is, in fact, a thing that they are always trying, by every device that occurs to them, to persuade the public to do. They not infrequently are criticised for adopting undignified and unworthy expedients to attract the crowd. The press, which is so careful a censor of the churches and their doings, is continually lashing ministers for preaching sensational and sec-

ularized discourses to catch the attention of the fickle multitude.

The conclusion follows, therefore, that to tax church property would not secure the common welfare of the people, but would tend to defeat the purpose of government. To tax it would be to deny that the State may render the same favors to religious as to secular organizations. To tax it would be, not to put all corporations on an equal footing, but to put one class of corporations at a decided disadvantage. To tax it would be to legislate against religion, not to leave it free and untrammelled. Those who oppose the exemption of church property on the ground that it is an unfair favoring of religion, advocate a policy of oppressing religion. They strain out the gnat while they swallow the camel.

We have thus far barely glanced at the chief objection made to exemption by such as are correctly represented in the action of the Canadian Baptists—namely, that to exempt church property from taxation is the same thing in principle as direct State aid to the Church. We have approached this position negatively, from the side of economics. It is time to look at it face to face. Is there no difference in principle, as we are so emphatically told, between giving a sum of money yearly out of the treasury to a church or sectarian institution of any sort, and releasing the said church or institution from the payment of a like sum yearly into the treasury? This distinction would seem to be clear, at least, that while grants from the treasury are direct aid, exemption is at most indirect aid. Government may give indirect aid to institutions and enterprises to which it can give no direct aid. Thus, it would not be constitutional to lay taxes on the people for the sake of paying subsidies to manufacturers, but it is constitutional so to lay taxes as to afford incidental protection to American industries. We may differ as to the economic expediency of a protective tariff, but we can surely see a very real distinction, both in law and in morals, between a tariff and a subsidy. But on what ground is exemption pronounced even indirect aid? If the State refrains from taxing me for owning and using a watch, does it thereby do the same thing as if it paid me money out of the treasury? Let us recall the definition of a tax—an assessment of the people, made by themselves, for defraying the expenses of government. Now if the people decide, in order to raise the necessary sum, that justice will be secured by taxing a certain class of property, well and good. But if they decide just the contrary,

equally well and good. In the first case they have oppressed no one; in the second, they have rendered aid to no one. It is nonsense to maintain that whenever the State refrains from taxing property it thereby in principle gives direct aid to the untaxed. On that theory we are all of us the beneficiaries of the State to a large amount.

But, it is urged, if church property is not taxed, the result will be that other property will necessarily be taxed more heavily. Whatever force this objection might have if we kept our eyes fixed on the abstract question of taxation, and excluded all other facts, it immediately falls to the ground when we take an all-around view of the case. Who does not know that the presence of a church in a locality increases the value of all the surrounding property? So fully is this fact appreciated, that speculators in real estate willingly give lots for the building of a church, in the full persuasion that they will reimburse themselves by the sale of the remaining lots at higher prices. Add to this the increased value of all property in a community, by reason of the restraint exercised on crime and pauperism by a church, and it is clear that other property owners have received a *quid pro quo* for every dollar of taxation that they pay on account of the exemption of church property. No injustice is done to anybody by this arrangement, but, on the contrary, substantial justice is done all around; for, if the church were to be taxed, it would be the one property owner in the community that would be deprived of the fruits of its own influence. As the immortal Sam Weller once remarked, "If my eyes was a pair o' patent double magnifying glass microscopes of hextra power, p'raps I might be able to see" the injustice that is done to the average taxpayer by exemption of church property, "but bein' only eyes, you see, my vision's limited." By increasing the amount of taxable value, churches decrease the tax levied on each individual; and by decreasing the chief expense of government they lessen the sum to be raised. In both ways the taxpayer profits, and it would be very small of him to protest against a state of things that is so much to his advantage. He does not. The protests come, not from the taxpayers and owners of property, but from fanatics and visionaries, who have little or no pecuniary stake in the matter. They are to be acquitted of the meanness of striving to injure the institution that is their benefactor. They are guilty of nothing worse than inconsiderate following of a theory to practically absurd conclusions. Perhaps the objection urged against ex-

emption that is least worthy of a respectful hearing is that it unduly favors the Roman Catholic Church. It would be more honest if this were put in the forefront by most of those who advocate the taxation of church property. They would then be doing in a straightforward way what they now are doing under false pretences—making their campaign on the basis of religious prejudice, and not on the basis of reason or economics. All the fine talk about religious liberty and total separation between Church and State, when it is closely analyzed comes to nothing more or less than hatred of Romanism and jealousy of its increasing wealth and power. Taxation is thought to be a weapon that will deal effective blows, and taxation accordingly is vehemently urged. For the sake of appearances, it is sought to give the agitation a legal and moral basis; but let the discussion go on long enough, and the animus against Romanism is certain to appear.

This is particularly true in Canada at the present time, where the zeal for complete religious liberty is hottest—if we believe the protestations of the zealots. In the Province of Quebec, we are told, the Romanists hold property valued at from \$100,000,000 to \$120,000,000, all of which is free of taxation. It includes not merely churches, but residences of priests and bishops, convents, seminaries, hospitals, and other real estate. The revenue of this property is estimated at not less than \$10,000,000, though this must be a large over-estimate, unless such property is vastly more productive in Canada than here, which may well be doubted. It is not alleged that this revenue is used for any other purposes than religious—the support of the worship of God according to the Roman Catholic faith and the maintenance of the schools and charities for which that church is honorably famous. When, therefore, our Canadian friends denounce the Roman Church as a money-making corporation, which ought to be taxed like other corporations that do business for gain, they evidently strain the truth quite as much as it will bear. The Roman Church is not like ordinary corporations, and no amount of assertion will make it like them. Stubborn facts are not to be changed by rhetoric. Charity and religion differ from business, and an organization that devotes all its revenues to these ends cannot be justly classed with organizations that exist with the avowed purpose of making money for the personal gain of their members.

Any American, however, will readily admit that the principle of exemption has been

pushed too far in Quebec. In the United States exemption is not given to all sorts of property owned by ecclesiastical bodies. The residences of the clergy are either not excepted from taxation at all, or excepted only to a limited amount. School property, even when owned and managed by a church, is not untaxed in most of the States. Other real estate than that used strictly for purposes of worship is subject to taxation if owned by a church, just as if it were owned by any citizen. The great corporation of Trinity Church, in New York City, is a good illustration of the American method. Trinity Church itself is not taxed, nor are certain chapels maintained by the corporation for religious worship. The bulk of the Trinity property, real estate in the very heart of New York, valued at many million dollars, pays taxes. This is just, for that property is leased for business purposes, and being managed with great skill by an able vestry, brings into the treasury of the corporation a great revenue. That revenue is used, almost to the last dollar, for religious and charitable work that is of vast benefit to the city; but even that fact is not allowed to exempt revenue-paying property from bearing its due burden of tax. A better example of the equitable application of the principles of taxation and exemption could not easily be found. Canada cannot do better than imitate on a large scale what is done in the case of this single parish. That done, the Protestants of Quebec will have no grievance against the exemptions granted to Romanists.

But this antipathy to Romanists, of which all enlightened Protestants ought to be heartily ashamed, as of any other relic of the Dark Ages, if it succeeds in obtaining the gratification that it seeks, will infallibly do Protestants more harm than Romanists. At least, this is true of the United States, and is probably true of every part of Canada except the single Province of Quebec. In the aggregate, the real estate held by Protestant bodies vastly exceeds in value that held by Romanists. This is true even of the great cities, where the Romanists have massed themselves, and where for generations a policy of accumulating property has been followed under shrewd leaders. Much more is it true of the country at large. Out of our sixty million people, not more than eight millions, taking their own highest estimate, are Romanists. It is highly probable that about the same ratio of property as of membership exists. An estimate made about a dozen years ago valued the church property of Romanists in the United States

at \$61,000,000, and that of Protestants at \$294,000,000. These figures have doubtless greatly advanced since that time, but there is no reason to suppose any material alteration in the ratio. If anything like this ratio still obtains, a general system of taxation applied to church property would impose burdens on Protestants five times as great as Romanists would be called upon to bear. How short-sighted the policy proposed! We have all heard of the man who cut off his nose to spite his face, but in truth he was a very Solomon compared with those who would have all church property taxed in order to burden the Romanists. As Talleyrand said, or is credited with having said, such a policy would be worse than a crime—it would be a blunder.

BROTHERHOODS.

BY WILLIAM BOYD CARPENTER, BISHOP OF RIPON.

From The Contemporary Review (London), Jan., 1890.

NEW proposals are strange revealers of human character. The proposal for the establishment of Brotherhoods is no exception. Those who have watched the discussion must have been amused, if they were not edified, by the variety of the comments which the proposal evoked. The philanthropic mind most probably was distressed to find that the merits of the proposal were obscured by the acrimony which was displayed. Extremists are never right, though they are always zealous. It may be questioned, indeed, whether a certain narrowness of understanding is not indispensable for a certain class of success. The fact that a theological turn could be given to the discussion made it possible that the proposal would not be discussed on its merits. Voltaire, speaking of Dante, said, "Il a des commentateurs : c'est peut-être encore une raison de plus pour n'être compris." The same complaint may be made respecting the present proposal. The comments have obscured the text, and the zeal of party has, as was to be expected, darkened counsel with words without knowledge and without charity.

This may sound severe language, but I think that it might be justified by a series of elegant extracts selected from letters contributed to the controversy. But no good would be done by printing words which are better forgotten. There would be no necessity even to refer to them, except for the

purpose of warning ourselves that the *entête* spirit of the zealot should be severely repressed, lest, while we wrangle, the more important aspects of the question should be forgotten, and the opportunity of good be lost.

At the outset it ought, in justice to those who made the proposal, to be remembered that it arises out of a great and confessed need. Archbishop Tait has told us "that there were districts into which it was not right to ask a clergyman to take his wife, in which to bring up his children; but if men could live together for a certain number of years, there would not only be a saving of expense, but they would afford each other the mutual help and sympathy they so much needed."* The Church, it has been declared times without number, cannot overtake the work which the rapid accumulation of town populations has thrown upon her. "How are we to reach the masses" has been a kind of commonplace of Church Congresses. The density of the population, the celerity with which towns have expanded, the strange and abnormal conditions of life which this state of things has caused, have thrown upon the Church work and duties which have strained the machinery, and for which it is declared the existing plant is wholly inadequate. This state of things is perplexing, and, from the rapidity with which it has come about, it is bewildering also. The multitudes gathered in our great towns are beheld by some with alarm, by others with compassion, and with a deep and perplexed sense of responsibility. Practical heathenism, lowered morals, enfeebled vitality, dull, spiritless, pleasureless existence are mentioned among the results. The plans which the philanthropist suggests are too often rank heresies in the eyes of the political economist, while it must be confessed that the political economist has little to offer in their place. Doubtless there are remedies which may, in process of time, heal this miserable condition of things; it may be true that there are great unseen forces in operation which will slowly readjust the unwholesome distribution of population. But forces like these will work but slowly, and Christian sympathy cannot bear to stand still and watch the growth of misery and sin without some effort to console and purify, if not to relieve. This spirit finds expression in the Church, who, like her Lord, must feel compassion for the multitudes. She feels that while we are deliberating on the best means of dealing with the problem, there are thousands who are prac-

tically perishing. Something for such present and crying needs is imperative. Such is the situation, and such are the feelings which have given rise to the proposal of establishing Brotherhoods in the Church of England.

If such needs exist, and new methods are demanded, any proposal emanating from experienced men is entitled to sympathetic attention. The present proposal may be wise or unwise, it may be possible or it may be utterly impracticable, but to cry it down unheard or to push it forward unconsidered, to use it as a stalking-horse for attacking unpopular doctrines or for advertising obsolete and retrogressive opinion, is to betray an ill-regulated mind. Certainly it is unworthy of a great and respectable party in the Church to prejudice its discussion by a picture, or to cry it down with a phrase; and it is no less undignified on the part of others to find in the discussion an opportunity of discrediting men whose very jealousy of innovation is evidence of their attachment to the Church in which they have labored.

All this is unfortunate, and it is illogical. It is never wise to speak before we know; it is always foolish to criticise what has not been proposed. Critics, in this case, might have remembered that it was just possible that those who were responsible for the suggestion did know a little history, and were not wholly ignorant of the dangers resulting from this or kindred proposals. At the same time it must be admitted that the proposal has been put forth in some quarters with phrases which could not fail to arouse suspicion. The Bishop of Durham, in his observations on the proposal, deprecated this flaunting of a red rag in a matter which needs above all things calm and judicial consideration.

It may allay some of the not unnaturally aroused suspicion to recall certain facts. It is a mistake, for instance, to suppose that community-life is the exclusive practice of any one portion of Christendom. Religious bodies, which cannot be suspected of Ultramontane leanings, possess institutions of the kind. There are religious communities at Kaiserwerth and Strasbourg which are in connection with the Lutheran Church. There are similar institutions at Paris and Echellins which are connected respectively with the French and Swiss Reformed Churches. It is, further, a mistake to suppose that institutions like the Religious Houses or Brotherhoods were favoured only by one party in the Church of England. Among those who lifted up his voice for

* "Systematic Lay Agency," *National Review*, No. 70, p. 515.

their continuance was the stout-hearted reformer, Latimer. Organizations of young men, devout and devoted to good works, in the seventeenth century, were recognized with approval by Bishop Beveridge as well as by Bishop Ken, by Stillingfleet as well as Tenison.

But while unreasoning alarm is to be deprecated, the risks ought to be considered.

If it needs to be constantly remembered that there is nothing which is necessarily Roman in the idea of Brotherhoods, it is no less necessary to observe the cautions and warnings which the history of such institutions reveals. We are neither to be deterred from making an experiment by the cry that it is Roman, nor are we to be blinded to the risks which we encounter by the eagerness of those who only welcome the proposal for the very reason which in others awakens alarm. There are dangers; and the evidence which is the most striking is that which comes from the Latin Church itself. It would be simple madness to ignore the lessons of the past. In the twelfth century, Arnulf, Bishop of Lisieux, requested Pope Alexander VIII. to dissolve the monastery of Grestain, on the ground that it was past reformation. At the close of the fourteenth century Nicolas de Clamenges charged the monasteries with being scenes of waste, idleness, and drunkenness. The Councils of Constance and Basel approved the statements of Bridget of Sweden, when she depicted the dark and low condition of the religious houses. In the sixteenth century a Committee of Cardinals (Reginald Pole was one of the number) expressed their opinion that the religious houses ought to be abolished. In the eighteenth century Scipio de Ricci, Bishop of Pistoia, excommunicated the Dominican friars, and forbade their officiating in his diocese. But perhaps the most remarkable illustration of all is one derived from our own days:—

"The total number of monasteries, &c., suppressed in Italy down to the close of 1882 was 2255, involving an enormous displacement of property and dispersion of inmates. And yet there is some reason to think that the State did but do roughly and harshly what the Church should have done more gradually and wisely; for the judgment passed on the dissolution by Pius IX. himself, in speaking to an English Roman Catholic bishop, was: 'It was the devil's work; but the good God will turn it into a blessing, since their destruction was the only reform possible to them.'"^{*}

It will be understood that I am not alluding to these for any controversial purpose. The lessons which such facts suggest are the common heritage of all Christian bodies; they shed light on the laws and conditions of human nature. It is interesting in this connection to recall a parallel from Oriental experience. In the East, as in the West, the risk arising from a disregard of simple principles is illustrated. The organization of the cloister was a powerful aid in the advancement of Buddhism, but only so long as the spirit of missionary zeal existed. When that ceased, monasticism became a hindrance instead of a help. In proportion as the "tendency to expansion of the Buddhist Church grew fainter, monasticism became a barrier in the way of every sound development, and thus the cause of utter stagnation."

Thus the forgetfulness of the conditions of life avenges itself sooner or later. There is a Quixotic disregard of laws which is sometimes called zeal. A man may run full tilt against a windmill with impunity, but the probability is that he will get the worst of the encounter. One man, or one group of men, may achieve what would be hopeless for others to attempt. The rule observed by one may be disastrous to the thousands, who, under the influence of some passing excitement or eager emotion, take upon themselves a burden which experience may show was too grievous for them to bear. Lifelong vows appear to me to be of this nature, when the vow involves that which is not necessary for righteousness' sake. The Convocation of Canterbury has realized this danger, and has pronounced against a system of lifelong vows. There is wisdom in this decision. To make a lifelong vow, in a matter which is neither within the survey of experience nor in the statute book of universal righteousness, is (if I may use an old-fashioned phrase belonging to an age of greater faith and less fussiness than the present) to tempt Providence. We may be asked if there is not such a thing as a call to celibacy. I have no doubt of it. Our Lord's words are sufficient for me on the matter; but he who is so called needs no vow: the call will be evidenced in the fact of his life. And it is to be remembered that a man may be called to be a father of saints who does not know of his calling till he is far advanced in life. To make a vow which anticipates or prevents the calling of Providence savours of little faith, not of large faith, and has in it a flavour of self-will rather than that spirit which waits on the will of Him who, though He orders the

^{*} See Article on Monasteries in "Encyclopædia Britannica."

whole life, yet veils from us His leadings from period to period.

To put the same thought from another standpoint, it is an unquestioned law of man's development that his powers, capacities, and necessities do not ripen in every man alike, in the same fashion, or at the same time. There are men who are boys in some of their qualities and powers till they have passed two-score years. Such do not waken to the consciousness of power or the possession of their complete manhood till they have reached, perhaps, the middle arch of life. To bind a man with a lifelong vow on matters which are hardly yet within the range of his own self-consciousness appears to me to be an act of at least doubtful wisdom.

But here it is urged that these exceptional cases may be met by exceptional means—the vows may be made dispensable by proper authority. Against this I entertain the very strongest objection. To do this is to weaken the sense of the sanctity of a vow, by dangling before the eyes of him who makes it the possibility that what is said to be lifelong need not be so in reality. To do this is to throw upon another a responsibility which, in the nature of the case, he cannot bear. To do this is to trifle with the most sacred thing on earth—the sanctity of a man's own conscience.

Might we not say that the very suggestion of dispensable vows bears strong witness against the proposal to make vows lifelong? The same difficulty does not exist when a time-limit is introduced into the agreement, so long as the limit is not a very distant one. If a society is to have sustained and continuous life in its work, those who join it ought to give a definite length of service. This seems both wise and needful. There ought to be no objection and no difficulty in the introduction of common-sense and business-like agreements as to the length of service. There are thousands who sign agreements to serve in particular places at special work for a specified period. An agreement of this sort, by whatever name it is called, ought not to rouse suspicion or jealousy. If the work is religious, the promise might well be made during some religious service. In any case, the promise to do religious work might surely be viewed as a promise to be religiously kept, and as having an obligation at any rate as binding as that which binds men in the military and civil service. It is unfortunately too much the custom to regard a promise in matters of religion as something which is only binding as long as it is convenient. Opposed as I am to life-

long vows, and disposed to regard vows of all kinds as indicating not a higher, but a lower, stage of religious life, I should be thankful to see a sterner sense of the nature of the obligations of religious service, and a sturdier determination to discharge such obligations, come fair, come foul, at home and abroad.

But this leads to another lesson which the history of religious movements most surely teaches, and which our own experience must, I think, confirm. We are in danger, nevertheless, of forgetting it. The value of organization, in one sense, cannot be exaggerated, and it has been argued that the power of such institutions depends on their being recognized as part of the organization of the Church. This has been urged recently. "These institutions flourished as long as their discipline was maintained; they drooped because they depended on individual exertion and piety." So writes Mr. T. Gambier Parry. What was wanted, says Mr. Huntingdon, was recognition and authority.*

There is doubtless truth in this view; but the other side must not be forgotten. Organization is not everything. Alone it is entirely valueless. We touch here a question which lies at the root of many problems. It has constantly been misunderstood; and misunderstanding is perilous. We organize free institutions, and we are disappointed to find that happiness is not secured to mankind by their existence. We organize Church work; and we are pained to find that organization does not always mean effectiveness. Pain and disappointment might have been avoided if we had been more ready to learn the lesson of history. Organization may afford great scope to life, and richer results to energy; but organization will not produce saints, nor the establishing of Brotherhoods create piety. Law made nothing perfect; rules cannot make evangelists. The order and the rule come after saintship, and rarely, if ever, do they precede it. The heavenly flame rests on some human soul. It burns within him, and with the Prophet he feels the fire of God; he yearns to work some deliverance upon the doubts. Like the Apostle, a noble necessity is laid upon him; the worst woe which can befall him is disobedience to a necessity which, like all the higher passions of life, is often a torment and a delight. While such a man lives, the life which he has chosen is noble and real. The same is true of all those in whom a kindred spirit

* *National Review*, No. 70, p. 597.

lives. The spirit finds its own organization. The rules which are laid down are the expression of the life which is in them and of the spirit into which they have been baptized. Their zeal, like a river, makes its own banks by following the course of its own nature. But even in the most favoured conditions the gentler life which gathers round the holy spires is not all that hope painted it—

“The potent call

Doubtless shall cheat full oft the heart's desires.”

The favourable conditions, moreover, cannot last always. The generation will arise which retains the form, but which has lost the animating spirit. There comes a time when the noble river runs dry; deadness and dryness take the place of freshness and murmuring life. Then, because the spirit which gave vital force to the movement is no longer there, the rules lose their force and value; the commandment becomes the means of death; the organization sinks beneath its own weight. When Saul is gone it will not do for David to wear his armour; when Achilles has passed away lesser men may but wound their hands and snap their muscles in striving to bend his bow. The spirit may inspire rules. Rules cannot restore the spirit. When we have the men we shall have the organization; but it is ill hoping that by adopting an organization we shall be in possession of the power to work them. Above all, let us avoid the belief that we can ever be great or achieve great things by imitation. Those who play the frog woo disaster. If the spirit which is in our midst be a true spirit, it must adapt its organization to the needs of our own age. It will draw useful hints from the past, but it will avoid all slavish and mechanical imitation of it. By virtue of its own real life, it will quicken, arouse, and direct all kindred zeal. Wherever a man in whom the true spirit dwells arises to work among the sons of men, brothers like-minded will gather round his standard, and the work of such men can never be in vain.

AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY MYSTIC.

BY EDWARD DOWDEN.

From *The Fortnightly Review* (London), Jan., 1890.

A CURIOUS document in the history of eighteenth-century religious life lies before me—a manuscript written by a careful hand on rough paper in ink now somewhat faded by the passage of the years. It is an Eng-

lish version of the manuscript autobiography of a Protestant pietist, born in France, but a resident in Germany—Charles Hector, Marquis St. George de Marsay. A transcript of the original by a friend of the author is preserved, I believe, in the Provenzial-Kirchenarchiv at Coblenz. A portion of a text, in all essentials identical with that of Coblenz, was printed in De Valenti's *System der höhern Heilkunde*, 1826; but I am not aware that any account has been given to English readers of De Marsay's strange history, except a brief sketch which forms part of a note in the second volume of Vaughan's *Hours with the Mystics*. The young writer of that interesting, but slender study of a great subject tells us that he had been lent by Mr. Tindal Harris a manuscript copy of the English *Life of De Marsay*. Whether the copy used by him was the identical volume now in my possession I am unable to say. More than one copy may have been made of a book supposed to tend to edification. Certain works, even in comparatively recent times, have enjoyed a life of considerable, though circumscribed, activity in the ambush of manuscript circulation. So it was in the earlier part of the eighteenth century, with the *Vie de Spinoza* attributed to the physician Lucas. De Marsay was no heresiarch like Spinoza, but his confessions are of so intimate, a nature that disciples may have felt that they were hardly suited for the crowd of ordinary readers. As they come to us now they have more than a private and personal interest; they furnish materials for the study of the psychology of a people and a period.

German pietism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was a great affair in the life of the nation. It was an escape from the tyranny of dogma that had stiffened into mere intellectual tradition. It was a restoration of moral life after the wreck and ruin wrought by the Thirty Years' War. It was, at a later date, a recoil of the emotions from the rationalism of the deists. Pietism satisfied after a fashion a real need of the time, a need felt not in Germany alone, but throughout every country of Europe. Molinos in Spain, Fénelon, Madame Guyon, and Antoinette Bourignon in France, Spener and Francke and Zinzendorf in Germany, William Law and John Byrom in England, differing, as they did, in many respects, were agreed in demanding for the soul a warmer emotional life than that approved by the religious orthodoxy of their day. We perceive from the “Confessions of a Beautiful Soul” in Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister* that the influence of the piet-

istic movement was not exhausted in the second half of the eighteenth century. But its sources had been to a great extent diverted to feed the literary movement of the time. Freytag has justly observed that the sentimentality of the Werther period was the stepdaughter of the emotional excitement of the elder pietism. In each there is a like habit of self-observation and endless self-confession, in each a like tender sensibility of spirit. And indeed the extravagances, irregularities, and licentiousness of the sentimental period can be paralleled, and more than paralleled, by the sensual orgies of perverted pietism, when, in its ambition to transcend the limitations of the flesh, it overleaped itself and fell on the other side.

Charles Hector de Marsay was born in Paris in the year 1688. His parents at the time of the persecution of the Reformed Church had left their estate near La Rochelle, and hidden themselves in the capital. The infant was baptized "in a Roman Church." It would seem that the family had fled soon after this from France to Germany. We know little of De Marsay's boyhood except that he was carefully educated in the reformed faith of his mother, and that he was attracted by the Scriptures and the books of devotion—writings of Jurieu and La Placette—which she had placed in his hands, exhorting him to read them three times a day! At an early age he became an ensign in the British-Hanoverian Regiment, which fought under Marlborough during the war of the Spanish Succession. Amid the distractions of the camp he strove hard to give himself up to contemplation and prayer, but being "entirely ignorant in the Inner Ways" he found that it put a severe and constant strain upon him to bring into some degree of harmony his duties as a soldier and his secret life of devotion.

"When the feast of Easter approached I doubled my exercises of contemplation, prayer, and self-examination in order to prepare myself worthily for the communion. I withdrew from all society of the officers, and spent the days, as far as my calling would permit, in a quiet retirement. God gave me at that time much grace, and such a zeal and taste of his love that I prayed three or four days without intermission, if not with the mouth yet always within myself; and although during this time our regiment was on a march and in a post where we were obliged to be under arms day and night, yet this troublesome circumstance did not hinder me to continue in prayer. It seemed to me I was already in Paradise, and was so simple as to believe this state would continue during life."

Such ecstatic happiness could not long endure, and with the trouble of mental distraction there came also bodily illness. Be-

lieving that death was near De Marsay lay sick for three months at Lille, and, though calm in mind, it now seemed to him that his past joys of the soul were nothing but baseless fancies. He might have learnt, as he tells us, from the *De Imitatione*, which was by his side, that the substance of true devotion does not reside in "felt sensibilities" and "sweetnesses," but in "love of the cross, self-denial, and the resigned will to receive all from the hand of God with equanimity, the sweetnesses as the bitternesses, the attention as the dissipation, the courtings of the divine bridegroom as his absence, the banishment of the heart as the love;" but he understood not what he read, and grasped with a spiritual greediness only at what might gratify his zeal. Failing in his desires after perpetual luxury of the soul, he had almost resolved to "let God enjoy his happiness in heaven, and to make himself merry on earth" in the common ways of the world, when a letter reached him from his comrade, Lieutenant Cordier, dated from the camp at Bethune, in which the writer assured him that the devotion they had hitherto practised was nothing, exhorted him to make acquaintance with the writings of Antoinette Bourignon, and informed him that he, Cordier, had resolved for his own part to quit the military service, to forsake the world, to withdraw to some desert, and there to lead a poor retired life. The letter added that the chaplain of the Hanoverian Regiment, M. Baratier, had taken the same resolution, and it closed with an invitation to De Marsay to join them in their retreat.

Bayle, in his Dictionary, having described Antoinette Bourignon's extreme uncomeliness of person, goes on in his mocking way to assert that she possessed not merely *immanent* but *transitive* chastity, the rare gift of "penetrative virginity," or frigidity, which not only preserves its possessor's heart from temptation, but freezes up the passions of all persons who may approach her. The most virtuous of *religieuses*, he adds, have in general been content with the more common gift of immanent chastity. Eagerly De Marsay bought up the writings of this illuminated lady in whose birthplace—Lille—he happened to be, and as he recovered strength read them diligently, though not without some fear lest he might fall into heresy. When restored to health he rejoined his regiment, now engaged at the siege of St. Venant, but it became clear to him that he must follow the example of his companions, abandon the career of a soldier, and lead henceforth a poor evangelical life in retirement. A regard for honour kept

him from seeking his discharge until the campaign was ended; he faced the dangers of the trenches and received no hurt, but it was a joy when at length in garrison at Brussels he could invite his soul and yield himself up to such writings as *The Obscure Night* of St. John of the Cross and the *Life* of St. Teresa. After considerable difficulty and delay the discharge from military service was obtained, and late in the autumn of 1711, at the age of twenty-three, De Marsay joined his two companions at Schwartzenu, where they had been permitted to settle on the property of the Countess of Wittgenstein, a devout lady who had already drawn into her neighbourhood many pious souls.

De Marsay shall himself record for us the doings and the trials of this period of his life. Let those persons who smile at the religious distress caused by his hearty craving for food remember that he is not singular in such sensibility of conscience. It was a light of the Oxford movement, Richard Hurrell Froude, who made the pathetic entries in his diary: "Looked with greediness to see if there was goose on the table for dinner;" "Meant to have kept a fast, and did abstain from dinner, but at tea eat buttered toast." There was something to warrant repentance, at least from an epicure's point of view, in De Marsay's choice of a cold potato as his criminal *bonne-bouche*.

"We three then began our community as Eremites, and lived very retired and solitary. Our outward order which we observed was thus regulated: we rose at four in the morning, and laboured each in his work with great stillness, after we had heard some chapters of the Holy Scriptures read by one of us. M. Baratier took care of the economy of the kitchen. Mr. Cordier and I went from four in the morning till seven o'clock, this spring 1711 [-12], out in the field to work and till the ground, to sow some fruit that we might have our bread. At seven we returned home and eat our breakfast of dry bread which we had baked ourselves. From that time till noon everyone had his work. Mr. Cordier's work was to spin wool, and mine to card wool and knit. It was also his part to go on errands, when it was needful to fetch something for us, and it was my part to gather leaves of trees, instead of straw, to lie upon, and to cleanse the stable. At noon we dined. Baratier boiled for us all the seven days of the week the same food. During one week we had a dish of peas and nothing else, neither before nor after, except a piece of bread to eat with the peas; the following week we had barley; the next buckwheat groats; the next oatmeal pap, and so on by changes. After dinner somebody of us read some part out of A. Bourignon's writings, then everyone went to his work until four o'clock. Then Cordier and I went again into the field to work till seven o'clock which was the hour of supper. This consisted in a dish of pulse or salad, groats, turnips, yellow turnips, or something else as the season of the year did furnish. After supper we remained in

our chamber at work till nine o'clock, when we retired to rest.

"So we spent the day, and kept silence in our employments. Our exercise was to be in a constant recollection, to be turned inward and remain in the presence of God. We spoke or asked nothing but what was necessary. Our drink was clear water, and when it pleased M. Baratier to give us a special treat, he boiled groats in milk for us. I can say that this was so delicate food that I could not master my appetite in it as I would. I tried it and sometimes took wormwood to overcome my taste, but all in vain, and I had constantly to fight against my desire of eating what was a grievance to me. For I had so warm a desire for the hour of meals and longed so much for it, that it put me in a continual conflict and caused me much suffering. For I had a great appetite to eat, and yet dared not satisfy the same without fear and doubt. I would during the meal keep my thoughts to the presence of God, but was much interrupted in it by my desire of eating, which many a year has exercised me. Among other things I remember that once I eat a potato between meals, for which I was severely reproved in my conscience. I would excuse the matter within myself and not confess my fault to God, but I fell into inward darkness, which was so terrible that it seemed to me as if I was plunged into the deepest abyss. I went out into the wood, and sat comfortless down on the stump of a tree. It appeared to me as if God had rejected me, and would have nothing to do with me, having given me up to myself, which gave me a deep and inexpressible pain. But this did not last long, and when I confessed my fault it pleased his goodness soon to dissipate this dark cloud and to restore me to my former calmness of mind."

It will be noticed that in this record of a day's doings no regular hours are mentioned as being set apart for prayer. The members of the little community, says De Marsay, endeavoured, in accordance with Antoinette Bourignon's directions, to make all they did a prayer, by doing it in God's presence and to please and serve Him. He himself ceased from his laborious efforts at contemplation, and his prayer became a childlike babbling of the heart to the invisible Friend: "this was the reason that I read but little, and what Brother Lawrence of the Resurrection mentions of this exercise of the presence of God which he practised in his kitchen work and when he made dumplings, that was also my business that I performed all my poor work in His love and presence."

Suffering much, however, for a time from spiritual aridity, he thought it well to consult and beg for the prayers of a pious shoemaker at Schwartzenu, one Maximilian Daut, who had written a prophetic book of some repute. On his way home from this visit, De Marsay heard the words of Scripture pronounced in his inward senses: "Is there no God in Israel that thou goest to Baal-zebul?" whereupon with a loud voice he took up the words, and repeated them again and again, while light and joy

arose in his heart. Still he looked to Daut for help of a humbler kind. For having a frequent combat with his laziness, he would have learnt the shoemaking business from the prophetic cobbler, but his whole body had grown lean and his fingers cracked and sore, which hindered him from his desire. It may indeed have been well for him that it was so, for he had always to strive against his inclinations, which would violently enter into whatever he undertook, and would dwell in them with pleasure, and the fascination of the awl and last might have won his affections from higher things. Even his knitting had a strange charm as he sat with his tackle before him: "and as I in this constantly received an inward reproach, I was often under a necessity to leave off from working, and to follow the attraction of God, who drew me softly and yet strongly into his holy presence." On one of these occasions, when he was drawn away from his work, it was suddenly disclosed to him that the activity of his intellect and the multiplicity of his desires in prayer were a hindrance to true communion. The voice spoke to him: *Thou art only a babbler! Be silent!* "This word stunned me, and made me immediately to do it, in that it gave me to perceive the intimate union, and a much more substantial presence of God than I had ever had in all my babbling, which I forsook from that time." The meaning of the prayer of silence had been disclosed to him. But now the body, that despised companion of the soul, began to take its revenge. Physically lowered as he was by M. Baratier's culinary economy, it is no wonder that De Marsay's desire of eating and laziness troubled him sorely; no wonder that the three members of the little community, not recognizing the cause, and attributing their state to Satan, became hysterical and light-headed. "Instead of silence and being turned inward, which hitherto we had observed, we began from morning till night to prate. My two companions were in the same situation with me. Finally we were no longer masters of ourselves. It seemed we were three merry brethren, which did nothing together the whole day but laughing, sporting, and playing the fool. This gave me great pain and sorrow. I thought, 'My God, what state is this and how will it end?' When I would reflect upon my lamentable state and endeavoured to restrain myself, a laughing so violently seized me that I thought I should burst, just as if I was possessed by a spirit who mocked my reflection and care." He was under the feet of the evil spirits, who

seemed to be given power to deal with him as they pleased.

Deliverance from this lamentable condition came not through active resistance, but through entire resignation to the will of God, through yielding, without terms, at discretion, to the Father who had sent this trial as a rebuke to his self-righteousness and self-will. Were it God's will, writes De Marsay, that his fall and utter ruin should be brought about, he was prepared to consent even to this; at which the transcriber, taking alarm, appends a note: "Some reader might think that the author had here pushed the resignation too far. But such souls as are destined for so high a union with God are led through these abysses." The hysterical extravagances into which the three cenobites had found themselves falling must have led them to question the wisdom of their austerities, and it was easy for them to regard these as mere works of the law—"our severe and exactly limited manner of living received a mighty shock; it was no longer possible to stick to the rules to which we had bound ourselves." The writings of Antoinette Bourignon lost their power over De Marsay; he had learnt to renounce his own will, and the thoughts which invited him back to his past way of severity seemed a temptation of Satan. He had before him as a warning the example of his companion, Cordier, who, unwilling to enter upon the gentler way of grace, withdrew for a time into complete solitude. "But Satan seduced him through pride, and when he had found a woman that on the outside had a great appearance of spirituality, in regard to her poor and severe life, in which she as a hermit lived all alone in a little hut in a distant place, he suffered himself to be seduced by this creature, that was a bad spirit, to marry her," and so, declining from bad to worse, became in no long time an Epicurean addicted to the world and the lusts of the flesh and under the power of Satan.

Happier was De Marsay's lot when, being brought gradually into the path of humility, discretion, sobriety, and modesty, he was called to enter into the state of holy matrimony, in order that he and his wife might live together in entire bodily abstinence, yet in entire spiritual union. "One day," he writes, "when in great calmness of mind I was sitting under a tree with my knitting tackle, it was shown to me, if it was true that I was willing to be the property of God without exception, it was his will that I should give Him the first proof thereof in marrying the Lady Clara

de Callenberg that then lived with the Dowager Castell." The Lady Clara was thirteen years older than her husband. She had grown up under the care of elder sisters, for at her birth her mother had become deranged and did not ever recover sanity. A deep impression had been made on the minds of the Ladies Callenberg, when Clara was about twenty-five years of age, by the conversation of certain Swiss and German pietists. As long as these spiritual teachers were persons of rank the ladies' brother endured their presence, but when two men of low descent took their place it was otherwise; the pious culprits were brought before the master of the house, who bade his servants cudgel them soundly, and then ordered them to prison. Fearing that the curse of God would descend upon their father's house, the five ladies resolved to remain in it no longer, and one Sunday, while their brother was at church, they packed up their things, dressed themselves meanly as daughters of common people, and accompanied by two maids, set forth—the seven virgins—on foot for Cassel. It was their purpose to push on to Erfurt, where living was cheap, and there support themselves by fine needlework. "While they were upon their way they saw that their brother came on horseback just meeting them, but, as he was shortsighted, they hid themselves behind a thicket of bushes on the side of the highway; so he rode past them very near without observing them." Before they could leave Cassel they were cited to appear before a commission appointed by the Landgrave to inquire into matters of religion in connection with the movement of pietism. It seemed to them that the examination was meant only to delay and harass them, and so, asking no leave, they departed on foot for Allendorf.

At this point the story of the Ladies Callenberg brings them into connection with the celebrated Eva von Buttlar, whose Philadelphia Society, founded somewhat on the model of the English associations of Pordage and Jane Leade, became infamous as a centre of the wildest extravagances of opinion, the maddest aberrations of the religious imagination, and the most reckless moral disorder. Eva had not yet risen to her highest eminence as the Door of Paradise, the New Jerusalem, the Second Eve, the Mother of us all, the Wisdom from Heaven. The little Mother (*Mama'chen*), with her companion Winter, the little Father (*Papa'chen*), and her young follower, Appenfeller, had not yet been elevated by their disciples into the Earthly Trinity,

Father, Son and Holy Ghost. But when Clara de Callenberg and her sisters (among them the unhappy Sidonie, whose spiritual wedlock bore fruit in an illegitimate child), were admitted to the community of Mother Eva, there was already enough loose familiarity visible among its members to give De Marsay's future wife a great disinclination to their companionship. She could not join them in their salutations and embracings, and thought that if this was the way which led to God, she could never hope to enter into his presence. Inheriting possibly some tendency to insanity from her mother, she fell into a profound melancholy, and "often designed to throw herself into some deep pit where no one could draw her out; but the good hand of God constantly preserved her in a hidden manner." Even after she had quitted the Philadelphia Society, her mental distress continued: "When she looked out of the window and any one passed by, she drew herself back, because she believed that all that cast their eyes upon her were bewitched by that looking on her, as she firmly had persuaded herself that she was a witch, and had founded that opinion upon the thoughts that were suggested to her, viz., that when God would not help her, Satan must." Her brother kindly received her back, and she, hopeless of salvation, pleased him by returning for a time to worldly ways, though with a deep sadness in her secret heart. At length deliverance came. One day walking in the garden as she listened to the joyous songs of the birds, a sudden desire possessed her to sing a spiritual song; she entered into her chamber, sought for her Halle hymn-book, and opening it came upon the hymn, "Immanuel, whose goodness is past numbering;" she lifted up her voice and sang amid a flood of happy tears. A passage from Jacob Boehme's writings gave her courage to seek and choose the higher way; she left her brother's house, ceased from lifeless churchgoings and sacraments, and lived in holy freedom with certain godly friends at Cassel. Not indeed without trials, for she had to sustain the shock of an attack from evil spirits and the magic of certain persons (Eva's people) with whom she was before combined; at night she heard mournful voices and the hissing of serpents; but the consolations of angels would follow while she sang divine songs in a voice so much above her usual voice that it seemed to be that of some holy spirit who had joined her. The trial was ended by the vision of a Lamb with a pearl on its neck, and a book shut and beautifully bound with

three silver laces—the book of her Inner State which the Lamb opened ; as the evil spirit withdrew she could not refrain from calling after him, “*Be ashamed, Satan ! be ashamed !*”

To draw her again into connection with Mother Eva's community, the Lady Clara's sisters sent to her, with letters of commendation proposing marriage, one Jacob Sander, the son of an apothecary of Wannefried, who, under a reputation for piety, concealed a life that was grossly vicious. Clara would have avoided him, but the arts of magic had been practised ; she found it impossible to rise up, and before Sander departed, her troth had been plighted. Happily, through the influence of her brother, the license of marriage with a person so much beneath her in rank was refused, and Sander, perceiving that he would in no case receive a dowry from the Lord de Callenberg, was content to let the matter drop.

The fact that the proposal of marriage had been made and accepted was sufficiently humiliating and did not serve Clara's reputation. For her comfort and guidance she saw one day when praying a cross let down from a clear sky, and supported on each side by a hand. At the foot of the cross was a finger-ring, and the words sounded in her ears, “*Espouse thyself to the Cross.*” With only one dollar in her pocket she withdrew to Schwartzenu, took up her abode with a pious gunsmith, and as he, his wife and new-born infant had but a single room, she would climb at night to a loft where she roosted till morning “*like a hen.*” At a later time she was received by the Lady de Dählwig, but still lived in poverty and self-denial. “*She was a diligent spinner, went herself to the next park to fetch wood for her fuel, and was very subservient to a countrywoman with whom she kept her economy ; which woman was also a good instrument used by God to exercise her in denial and subjection.*” Clara was thirty-eight years of age when she was joined in wedlock by the late army chaplain Baratier to De Marsay.

The joint fortune of the newly wedded pair amounted to fifteenpence ; but they possessed the “*capital of faith,*” and were under no care at all for earthly things. Clara had not married below her condition, and was accordingly entitled to a dower of two hundred florins from a public foundation in Hesse. This her husband had the prudence to secure. Cordier, the former companion of De Marsay, was about to undertake with his wife a journey to Jerusalem, and offered the bride and bridegroom the use of his little cottage perched on the

declivity of a mountain amid a forest on the side of the Gersbach Valley. This clay hut, with earthen floor and one small window, enclosed a space about eight feet by eight. The nearest human habitation was quarter of a league away ; Schwartzenu was twice that distance from them. But when their furniture had been removed to the cottage in a wheelbarrow, they needed nothing for their happiness : “*We thought we were in Paradise, such a delight and inward peace it pleased God to give us.*”

The news of his marriage did not please De Marsay's mother, nor had she entire confidence in the wisdom of setting up house on the capital of faith. To quiet her apprehensions, and if possible to effect her conversion, De Marsay left his wife in the year 1713, and set off on foot for Geneva. The French were besieging Landau, which obliged him to make a detour ; he was warned of dangers from robbers, but encountered none of the marauding gangs which infested the disturbed country. He walked swiftly by roads that were unknown to him, yet only once strayed from the way. When in doubt as to his path, it was his custom to shut his eyes, turn in faith to God, and proceed without reflection. But though he reached Geneva in safety, the object of his journey was not at once attained. His mother was loyal to the Reformed religion ; her Separatist son set all its defects before her ; “*we spent our time,*” he writes, “*chiefly in disputing.*” After ten days he turned his face towards Schwartzenu, and was once again in his hut upon the hillside after an absence of seven weeks.

Perhaps it was the heat aroused within him by the contention with his mother which now transformed itself into a desire to go forth and preach to all nations ; in doing so, he would fain follow the example and assume the contemptible attire of the apostles. His wife had been always sickly, but she announced her intention despite every weakness to follow him throughout the world. By the wise counsel of Baratier he was led to distrust his own missionary fervour, and after a time came to look upon the design which had so strongly attracted him as a device of Satan to bring him to destruction through spiritual pride and ambition.

The household economy in the cottage was of the simplest kind : “*We were quite filled with sensual sweetness [in devotion], and strongly attracted to the prayer of rest, so that we grudged the time to be spent in boiling our soup, and would therefore try to eat nothing but bread and butter and*

drink clear water." This diet did not suit Clara's weak health, and it was an advantage in some respects when they joined the poor widow Gruber in a somewhat larger house, quarter of a league distant from the hut. From her they learnt housekeeping; her garden was large, and two goats supplied them with milk. But the active duties enforced by the widow, though wholesome for the body, were a hard chastisement. The sweetnesses of prayer had to give way before the necessity of carrying dung up the hillside, of cutting wood or fetching grass and leaves for the goats. "It was shown to us that this honest widow was given to us to break our own will and to afford us exercise. This indeed she did in a masterly manner, and gave us daily opportunity of self-denial." After their open-air labours, an occasional treat was permitted them of little rye-meal cakes mixed with pounded yellow turnips. Flesh meat was a luxury unknown to the cottagers. They gathered wood-herbs for their food in spring, and in summer the mountain slopes provided abundance of wild strawberries.

At this time Cordier, with his wife, returned from Damascus, where they had stopped short, being unable to pay the sums demanded by the Turks for admission to the Holy Land. They settled in the unoccupied clay hut, and wore an appearance of pious self-denial; but their true principles soon appeared in an attempt to effect a separation between De Marsay and his wife, whom Madame Cordier regarded with hostility. Enraged by her failure to effect this object she induced her husband to accuse De Marsay, his wife and the widow Gruber of abominable living. They were summoned to appear before the authorities, but when the accusers were required to bring their charges home, Anna Maria Cordier could say no more than that her heavenly Father had manifested it to her. This evidence was not held to prove the defendants' guilt; Madame Cordier was told that she had her information from the devil, and so the matter ended.

The widow Gruber, though innocent of the accusations brought against her, was a tyrannous presence to her contemplative companions, with her overwhelming energy and masterful ways. "She did as much as possible according to her own will and disregarded our will; this tempted me to an averseness to her and occasioned a good deal of suffering." An amicable separation was effected, and De Marsay and his wife were once more in solitary possession of the cottage.

About this time, one day in mid-winter, a woman of the Palatinate came to visit their nearest neighbour, Mr. Gross, formerly a minister, at present a devout Separatist, the husband of Mrs. Gruber's daughter. The visitor, Sophia, had formerly known Mr. Gross, and now sought his spiritual consolation; she was in extreme distress of mind and "had enfeebled her body to a great degree by fasting, watching, laying herself in the snow and water, suffering frost, to do penance as she said." Her visit was almost at an end, for she had announced her intention to return home next day to the husband with whom she had led an unhappy life. At midnight she opened the door and slipped out into the darkness. Apprehensive lest she might hurt herself, Mr. Gross and his wife followed her, roused De Marsay and his wife, and accompanied by them searched through the wood, calling loudly on Sophia as they advanced. After some hours' search they heard a lamenting voice and found the poor woman lying quite naked upon the ice. They wrapped her in her clothes which lay scattered about, and bore her back to Mr. Gross's chamber, where, after some hours, she expired. A coffin was procured, and it was intended to bury her in Mr. Gross's garden. On the night before the burial the coffin was placed outside Mr. Gross's cottage door; but, in doing this, he and his wife were seized with an inward anguish, which was also experienced by De Marsay's wife. They felt themselves constrained by their dead sister to bring back the coffin into the little chamber; then the anguish ceased, and the four companions sat up that night and waked the corpse, being very joyful in the Lord and calm in mind, while they lifted up their voices in spiritual songs. They had an assurance that poor Sophia had been received into the grace of God, but because she had been self-willed in her severities against herself and deficient in meek resignation, it was needful that she should submit after death to a brief period of painful yet blessed purification, which she might have sustained in this life by patient suffering, but would not. As she yet entirely lived in the inner senses, and had not attained to the higher life in the spirit," "she had after death," writes De Marsay, "a power to communicate herself to our inner senses, because we were not come farther than to the state of the senses within. For the souls that live in the same ground and principle have a mutual communication."

What follows may be commended to the consideration of the Psychical Society:—

"We buried her the next day in our garden. The following night, when we were gone to rest, we heard that the door of our little house was opened. I thought I had not rightly locked it, got up to shut it, and reflected no further. The night after that door, though locked with a good lock, was again opened. I went again to fasten it and neither I nor my wife thought then that there was anything extraordinary in it. The same opening of the door happened the third night. Then we had the next day a strong impression that Sophia did thus, in visiting us, to draw comfort in her suffering condition.

"This impression seized us entirely; at night we lay down in a persuasion she would come again, and when we had extinguished our lamp our room door, which we knew was very well shut, was opened. 'This is Sophia,' whispered we to each other. I began courageously and without any terror to say to her, 'She was welcome; if she would go with us to Jesus, there we would meet one another, there alone would we be found.' I exhorted her to take her refuge to Him; if this was her resolution, as it was ours, her visit would be there pleasing to me. My wife was in fear because she had often suffered from such spirits, and pushed me to be silent. When I had done speaking, the door, which I had shut after the entry of Sophia, was opened again, and I told my wife, 'Now the soul of Sophia departs.' My wife was full of joy and called these words after her: 'Ah! my dearest Jesus, make to thyself a pure dwelling in my heart, that I may never forget Thee! May it be so with thee, poor soul; go hence into the rest of the Lord!'

"I arose again and locked our room door. After that time she never came again to visit us, but we had a strong impression that her soul was again entered into the order of the Lord, and consequently into rest also, which is always in his will and order. We have seen nothing with our corporal eyes, but the impression of her soul on ours was very calm and soft. When she opened our door it was done gently and quietly, without boisterous noise, as a token of the state in which she found herself, not in rebellion or opposition to God, but in a restful, humble suffering."

From this time onwards De Marsay's life, though it underwent no violent alteration, turned outwards; ecstasies and visions are rarer, and he moves onward in closer communion with his fellow-men, and, on the whole, with a wiser and a calmer mind. Perhaps the sufferings of poor Sophia had opened his heart in sympathy with sorrow. The change first showed itself by his employing himself in useful works on behalf of his neighbours, watching by the sick, or working with his hands for those who needed a labourer in the woods and fields. A timely gift of thirty dollars from his mother reawakened his affection for her and his desire to see her converted. Accompanied by his wife he set off (1715) once more on foot for Switzerland. They walked from six to nine leagues a day: "My wife was often as half dead with weariness. She then threw herself on the ground in the presence of God, and when thus she had

rested a little while, God gave her new strength to continue her way." Clara remained at Neufchatel while her husband pushed forward to Geneva. But the meeting with his mother brought little happiness; she strongly desired that her son should find some worldly employment, and the situation of book-keeper to a great merchant in Paris was offered for his acceptance, but he could not entangle himself in the cares of business. Devout ladies welcomed De Marsay and his wife to Berne. There they spent the winter of 1715-16, preserved from overmuch society by the great snow of that year. It was not till the autumn of 1716 that, having voyaged down the Rhine, they once more found themselves in their retreat at Schwartzenau.

They looked back with a sense of shame at the faults into which intercourse even with godly persons had betrayed them, and determined to live henceforth in greater self-denial. They divided among the poor their store of victuals and such linen and other goods as they possessed; they sold their house for thirty-five dollars, distributed twenty to those who had greater need of the money than themselves, and with the remaining fifteen dollars bought a little room on the impoverished ground of Christianseck, a solitary place on a height, where stood a few scattered houses inhabited by pious people, about a league from Schwartzenau. But light and joy did not attend this self-denial: "I went and spent half-days in the wood in the hope of recovering spiritual sweetnesses in that solitude, but all in vain. How much soever I endeavoured to enjoy the presence of God, in a manner that conveys delight to the inner senses, it was all without effect, and I perceived my gradual falling into dryness and aridity."

During these days De Marsay willingly accepted the alms volunteered to him by godly persons. But he now questioned whether this could be rightly done, since he might claim from his brother a portion of the family property, and his wife was entitled to a share of her brother's wealth. Husband and wife, though not possessed of twopence, determined to start on their several journeys, the one to Paris on his way to the home of the De Marsays near La Rochelle, the other to the lands of the house of Callenberg near Cassel. A friend furnished them with a few dollars, and they bade each other farewell. "On my way, as I travelled alone," De Marsay writes, "I had a strong impression that God had assigned me an angel for a companion, where-

of I was so sure, as if I had seen him with my corporal eyes; this made me to travel with a joyful mind through an unknown land." On reaching the French frontier he feared that he might be arrested if he were known to be a Frenchman entering from foreign territory. "The means I used to prevent this was to clean my shoes, and to fit myself up as if I was no traveller. Thus the sentry permitted me freely to pass at the gate of Verdun, which was the first city I passed. I had no pack nor baggage, and but a shirt in my pocket. After the guard had let me pass, I was called back again and asked, 'Sir, from whence do you come?' to which a sergeant that was there replied, 'Let him pass, he is a man of Sirk' (Sirk is a little city two hours from Verdun, and belongs to the Elector of Trier). I said, 'I come from Sirk;' thus they took me for a German, and suffered me to pass without further examination." On October 18, 1717, he entered Paris.

It was the time of Law's financial schemes, when De Marsay, occupied with his private financial affairs, reached the capital. To his surprise he learnt that his brother had been appointed British envoy at Geneva, and was no longer in France. A kind letter assured the penniless wanderer of his brother's warm goodwill, and enabled him to procure an ample supply of money. His wife had been less fortunate, but now they were placed above want, and it was arranged that she should proceed to Berne where her husband would rejoin her after he had visited his kinsfolk at Geneva. The change was great from their previous state of poverty, and De Marsay feared lest it might fare ill with his soul amid this worldly prosperity. But Providence, as he felt, was leading him even by such gentle means, to humility and a surrender of his own will. "God pulled all my pillars away which I had secretly built up in my manner of living formerly practised, and He removed me besides out of that lightsome faith full of assurance and certainty, in which hitherto we had stood, and made me enter into that mere or bare and dark faith which is divested of all those certainties, and in which you must be led as a child without light by the hand of the parent." His brother was surprised and pleased to find him so little of the austere ascetic; in a few days they became very good friends, and went together to sermons and holy communion, a concession which had not been expected from the recluse. A yearly allowance was assigned to De Marsay, and when a little later he departed for Berne he took with him his brother's best wishes.

For a considerable time he remained in Switzerland, finding both at Berne and Vevey persons of his own way of thinking. Although his outward self-denials were fewer than before, he felt more strongly than ever "the attraction to the Centre," which draws the will into harmony with the Divine will. "This attraction and impulse is so spiritual, and so far above all what is in the sphere of the senses or reason, that they cannot reach to it;" of such inconceivable subtlety that when you desire clearly to know and consider it, the attraction disappears and is gone. A new and strange anxiety, however, troubled him; he feared that his annual income might not suffice for his expenditure, and, moved by this and other causes, he decided to return to his little room at Christianseck. On the journey, about half a league from Bâle, his wife became seriously ill; it was evening, no house was near, and the passers-by were hastening to enter the city before the gates should close. "I confess that among all the trials that had befallen us this was one of the most sensible—to be near the gates of a large city without the least assistance. I fancied no one in the world was so unhappy as we, that could stay in no place but were fugitives like Cain." Night drew on, his wife's death seemed imminent, and he could not bear to leave her alone while he sought for help. "At last, after some hours' suffering, my wife found a little ease. I went softly along with her, and we arrived in the city, going through a great part of it till we came to the Baroness de Planta, who received us kindly and procured us a lodging."

Once more in a house of his own at Christianseck, De Marsay felt the need of some regular occupation, without which he could not keep his "ground," knew not where he was, and even feared that he might fall into libertinism. His mother would have been pleased to see him return to the military profession, and he was ready to submit even to this, but his brother wisely opposed a project so little suited to his temper of mind. A better way was opened for him when Divine Providence brought a good soul to lodge with him, one Godfrey Koch, "a watchmaker and an Israelite in whom was no guile." Together the two men studied the mysteries of wheels and pinions and escape-ments: together they pored over the deeper mysteries of the soul as explained in the spiritual writings of Madame Guyon. In the course of a year De Marsay had acquired much skill and knowledge in his craft as watchmaker. A great circuit had been traversed from the ambitious days when he

dreamed of playing the part of an apostle through all lands : " Now I saw myself as one cast to the ground, and reduced to that abject state as to work from morning till night upon a watch and to be busy about earthly things. This was a great abasement in the eyes of my self-loving spirit, but my ground rejoiced and whispered to me, ' See ! thy pride is stung at eating grass like an ox with Nebuchadnezzar, but really such material things are at this time better and less dangerous for the sensual and rational part of the soul, or for her inferior part, than the spiritual matters, when the soul will take them into her own comprehension and capacity, and this is that death which is absolutely necessary ; by it God will bring thee to the life of the spirit, that the Centre may be discovered and disentangled.' " Seven years were thus spent in quietness and patient work, without any remarkable external events.

In 1724 his wife's declining health, which suffered from the cold air of Christianseck, induced De Marsay to move to Heidelberg. Here he continued his work as watchmaker under a more skilful master than Koch, but all the deftness of his fingers seemed to be lost. He was as awkward as if he had never handled a file. " I observed," he tells us, " that God would restrain me from being entangled and captivated by this mechanical spirit, and not permit that I should become so ingenious and accomplished a watchmaker. This made me tired of the subtle working." The more delicate craft expected by his Heidelberg master, no doubt, was unattainable by the elderly pupil of a journeyman like Koch.

The illness of his mother brought De Marsay again to Switzerland. He was saddened to find that many of his former friends had turned back to the world. Among these was the Abbé de Watteville, a correspondent of Madame Guyon ; he was now married, and declared that all that had passed with him in the days of his fervid faith was like a dream ; " in short everywhere was misery and dissipation to be seen among our old friends, with a mortal deadness, and we ourselves knew not where we were." An invitation from the Countess of Wittgenstein - Berleburg determined De Marsay and his wife to fix their abode in her neighbourhood. They were warmly received at Berleburg by high and low ; so much time indeed now began to be spent in useless conversations that De Marsay decided to entertain his visitors by reading aloud a sermon for them ; but somehow this edifying species of good-fellowship did not

entirely succeed. He longed for solitude, and yet in solitude he suffered much misery. It was a comfort to him when he learnt, first from books and then in his own experience, that involuntary dissipations of the imagination do not necessarily hinder the prayer of rest. Three times a day he placed himself without trouble or commotion of mind in the mental attitude of prayer, and accepted whatever degree of the spirit of devotion might be granted to him. And now, through the persuasions of " the famous Dr. Carl," he was induced to take a part in certain assemblies where every one had liberty to propose a divine matter, to speak concerning the same, or to pray. For some weeks all went well, and every one pressed to these meetings of the devout ; but the concord and communion of saints were of short duration. " Spiritual pride, love of mastership, spiritual voluptuousness, and all other abominations of this sort, a desire of new things, curiosity, envy, hatred, sensual adherence followed one another successively, and all these poisonous animals entered our meeting. It is true they came not barefaced but masked." Many high-flying spirits would consent to no way but their own. De Marsay began to perceive that congregations or societies of this kind cannot subsist without human laws ordained to restrain the spirits within the limits of reason, decency, and regularity. The overflowing pleasure which he had felt at first in his own extempore prayers seemed to him before long to be rather a carnal than a spiritual delight.

Soon after his arrival at Berleburg letters had come from America, describing Pennsylvania as an earthly Paradise. With two or three hundred dollars one might purchase a considerable parcel of land ; the soil was fruitful ; there was full liberty of conscience to live as a good Christian in solitude ; there was employment for all, and especially good employment for one skilled in watchmaking. A large number of persons, nearly one hundred, resolved to emigrate, and De Marsay, with his wife, had a mind to join the party. His mother and brother, however, strongly opposed the project, and for a time it was dropped. When it was revived in 1726, De Marsay contrasted in his fancy the charm of solitude in the earthly Paradise in Pennsylvania with the bickering and backbiting of the religious meetings at Berleburg. He was ready to depart, and had taken leave of his friends, when letters arrived, giving a lamentable description of the misery endured by the emigrants ; many had died from the

hardships of the voyage, among them the good old widow Gruber and her daughter. At first it seemed to De Marsay as if these tidings were a call to him to endure hardness, and that the prospect of suffering and death made it more than ever desirable that he should commit himself to God and embark. He saw, as in a vision, his wife dying in great misery and her body thrown into the sea. His heart was touched to the quick, yet he could not desist from his resolution. But a way of escape was opened: "One evening when I was preparing for rest, and in my prayers placed myself and my wife before God as two animals of sacrifice, that with full consent and surrender would expect nothing else but to be offered up, there rose at once from my inner ground a soft and placid conviction in my understanding, which showed me, 'It was enough; the sacrifice was made, we had now offered our Isaac, God did not require any more from us;' and this offering of Abraham was in a quite peculiar manner represented to me, with an addition of signifying that we should no longer think of the voyage, but keep ourselves quiet." This sufficed for the occasion; but it was afterwards shown to De Marsay that the desire he had for outward solitude in the Transatlantic wilds was an impure passion, having selfishness for its chief ingredient.

In September, 1730, the Count von Zinzendorf arrived at Schwartzenau, whither De Marsay still resorted in the summer. Zinzendorf was by many years the younger man, but he was already famous for his talents as well as his piety, and had already established his common order of worship for the brethren at Herrnhut. De Marsay and his wife dined with him at the house of the Countess Dowager de Wittgenstein: "but notwithstanding all the good opinion the public had of him, it appeared to my wife as if he had such a physiognomy, more internally than outwardly, which was quite contrary to her, and made her to have an aversion against him." From Schwartzenau the Count proceeded to Berleburg, and there every day held spiritual assemblies, where by his fine appearance and humble yet eloquent words he drew many souls captive. Among these, notwithstanding their dislike on first acquaintance, were the De Marsays, and it may perhaps have been that the magic of evil spirits, against which De Marsay afterwards wrote, contributed to the fascination. An attempt was made to establish at Berleburg another community like that of Herrnhut. On three successive Sundays De Marsay supplied the place of a

brother who had fallen sick, and preached with such unction and power that he himself wondered at it, for he had never before delivered a public discourse. It almost seemed as if it were in his choice to become another Zinzendorf. He stood, as it were, at the parting of the ways. Should the watchmaker rise into the apostle? His answer was given without hesitation: "When I was in my prayer the choice was given me inwardly, whether I would be enriched with the like gifts to edify my neighbour, and by being endued with extraordinary talents, that bear a great appearance, be esteemed as a saint among the godly . . . whether I would be in a state of a clear light and tasting faith, which enables us to apply these talents with a great perception in the senses, and with a zeal that conquers them; or whether I would choose to be stripped of all these things and to die off from them in the way of a dark faith and terrible desert that had no end but to die off from all. The inclination of my ground did then without any hesitation immediately choose the latter state and rejected the first." And from that moment all his gifts of unction and eloquence departed from him. He withdrew from the public assemblies of the saints, and would enter into no dispute with this one or that—"It is best to be silent and keep your mystery to yourself." His wife, with some uncertainty as to whether she was right, followed his example. When any person would persuade her that her conduct was erroneous she defended it with energy, but as soon as the person was gone her former doubts returned.

The sometime Separatist, De Marsay, now desired to frequent again the Reformed Church, after he had "got rid of all the little divided sects that had occasioned us so much suffering and with which we would have no further connection." Not that he would allow church-going to be a slavery; he still claimed the liberty to attend public worship or to stay away as he was moved by his inward "ground." He had through much pain and shuddering awe been given "a propensity to that pure intuition, which is the continual office and privilege of the seraphim," but he no longer undervalued the outward ordinances of religion. He had seen at Schwartzenau the miserable results of the Separatist movement on young people, who had been brought up without attendance at the services of the Church, who had not inherited the internal godliness of their parents, and who had given themselves up in many instances to the spirit of libertinism. Still for his own part he was happiest

alone with his Bible or his *De Imitatione—in angello cum libello*. And a way of usefulness to others was discovered to him when in 1734 he found that he could employ his pen with good effect in the cause of religion. It seemed to him that he was like a man "that for many years on a long voyage had been carried through many unknown countries with tied-up eyes; when the band that blindfolded him is removed all is a wonder to him when he reviews all the ways through which he has been led." In September of that year he felt as though the pure fire of the Divine love possessed him wholly: "one night especially, which I shall never forget, God alone knows what then passed; it is beyond description; I must not speak of it, but be silent and adore. Only this I will mention, that from that period of time all my troubles, anxieties, and griefs are vanished, there is now no care nor sorrow for anything whatever remaining." We shall not pry with conjecture into that mystery of joy.

On February 21, 1742, after twenty-nine years of spiritual union, for in this sense only was it marriage, De Marsay lost his wife. Two letters which he wrote on that occasion are preserved. The closing weeks of her life were darkened by a terrible despair of her salvation. "She experienced," writes her husband, "the descension to hell with Christ," nor was there any lightening of her anguish before the end. It was happy that before this sorrow, De Marsay had gained a dear friend in M. de Fleischbein, who had first sought his services as a watchmaker, and afterwards had come to love him with a brotherly affection. Other friends were found in some young kinsfolk of his own, children of his second sister, the Lady de Carlot. His elder years were calm and happy. The substance of his faith in its final form is thus expressed in his own words:

"I have lost all thoughts of a mystical state, and rest humbly and simply on the grace in Jesus Christ. . . . Not that I reject or disbelieve the truth and substance of all the mystical states whereof I have wrote. No! but the thoughts, the form and the image of them is taken away from me by the afore-mentioned state of humiliation." To the last, however, his devout habit of discovering special providences in the incidents of his life remains. He had found that the use of a prayer-book was necessary to him for purposes of private devotion and had chosen Gottfried Arnold's *Prayers of the Spirit*. He had presented his own copy to a certain nobleman, and tried to procure another copy,

but all in vain: "this made me believe it was not the will of God I should any longer offer my prayers to him in that fashion! And really from that time it pleased him in his infinite goodness to restore to me gradually the attraction to the simple internal prayer, whether in silence in his presence, or in words expressed by love, or in simple thoughts and love-affections, quite unrestrained and free as it pleased Him to give."

At Ambleben on February 3, 1753, De Marsay died aged sixty-five. M. de Botticher, his sister's son-in-law, and the Pastor Gerhard were with him during his illness. He looked forward to his death with cheerfulness. "I swim and bathe in joy," he said a few days before his death, "that I shall now soon obtain what, through the grace of our Saviour, I have so long ardently wished and hoped for." Only one harsh gesture was observed before he drew his last breath.

I have ended my task as recorder of this fragment in the history of Eighteenth-Century Pietism. If there be morals to be drawn and practical applications, I must leave these to the reader.

TESTIMONIALS TO THE LATE BISHOP LIGHTFOOT.

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, Jan. 11, 1890.

THE death of the Bishop of Durham brings a deep sense of sorrow and bereavement; not to his diocese alone, nor yet merely to the Church of England, but to the whole of Christendom. To speak of only one thing, his scholarship was a possession of the entire Church, and a gift to all who name the name of Christ.

One can hardly help a feeling of regret that he was not left at Cambridge to do the work which none could do as he did, instead of being transferred to such a diocese as Durham; where the attempt to continue his own special work side by side with the discharge of his official duty has broken him down at the age of sixty-one.

We do not, assuredly, undervalue the "office and work of a bishop." But there are other things which the Church needs as well as what he can do. And what stands higher among those other things than just such work as Dr. Lightfoot was doing when he was taken away from it and sent to Durham? One must feel that it is a poor economy of the "diversities of gifts" when men are taken from lines of labor for which God originally fitted them, and for which, under

Him, they have trained themselves, and are burdened with what they do, admirably indeed, but what others might hope to do as well; and, meantime, are estopped from that which none can do as they can. Such regrets are, no doubt, vain, but one cannot help lamenting such seeming waste.

Possibly Dr. Lightfoot's greatest work—great it certainly is—will be considered to be his volumes on Ignatius and Polycarp. It may well be the boast of our mother Church that two of her prelates, Pearson in the seventeenth and Lightfoot in the nineteenth century, have accomplished for the Ignatian Epistles what no others—Zahn can hardly be reckoned as an exception—have accomplished. It suits certain persons, some of whom have never read him, to sneer now at Bishop Pearson. But his "*Vindiciæ Epistolarum Sti. Ignatii*" was as remarkable a treatise for its time as Bishop Lightfoot's is now. The two together are a monument to the scholarship of the mother Church which the devouring tooth of time will never destroy.

The latest of his works, the defence of the supernatural character of our holy religion—the latest in point of actual composition, but as gathering into one volume what had not before been collected—deserves to stand by the side of the immortal work of another great Bishop of Durham, so worthily characterized by Southey.

But it is, after all, as a commentator on, and expounder of, Holy Scripture that Bishop Lightfoot claims, it seems to us, his greatest pre-eminence. It is one of the unhappy results of the present tendency "*jurare in verba magistri*," that so many seek a leader whom they can blindly follow, rather than a teacher to whom they can intelligently listen. Hence, if there is disagreement on a single point, the man and his work are both rejected, and, because he cannot be followed in everything, he is listened to in nothing.

In saying this we have in mind Bishop Lightfoot's dissertation on the Christian Ministry appended to his commentary on Philippians. There can be no doubt that the dissertation has been widely used in the interests of Parity—or one might better say of Indifferentism—in regard to any ministry at all in the Church; for that is what the theory of Parity has developed into. But it is very significant that the bishop himself has said, "I do not hold myself responsible for the interpretations which others (whether friends or opponents) have put upon my language, or for the inferences which they have drawn from my views." We, certain-

ly, cannot accept the theory that the Episcopate is a growth upward from the Presbyterate, and not a localization of the Apostolate. But no one who reads the dissertation can fail to note—we quote the words of its principal opponent—"its thoroughly accurate and profound research, its calm judicial tone, and, above all, its transparent impartiality, leading the writer to distrust conclusions in favor of his own clerical position rather than the contrary."

Indeed, the very first feeling one has in reading the bishop's commentaries—alas that we are to have no more!—is that he is in communication with a thoroughly genuine and fair-minded man—a man to whom one's confidence may be freely given. Nor is this fair-mindedness that mawkish and miscalled candor which is so afraid of offending an opponent that it prefers to be faithless to the truth. It is anything, indeed, but that. At the same time, it always prevents and holds back the understatement of a difficulty, and still more does it forbid its suppression. We are confident that the late Bishop of Durham was at all times ready to admit that in the Epistles of St. Paul are "some things hard to be understood," some things, in truth, which the most learned commentator—to say nothing of the youngest clergyman—cannot explain.

Then, again, to Bishop Lightfoot, St. Paul was a living man, "of like passions with ourselves," and not a lay-figure. He wrote to living men, with their actual surroundings, conditions and circumstances, and not to other lay-figures. And hence his Epistles are living words, in interpreting which the writer's own characteristics, line of address and methods of dialectic are to be taken into account, and also the circumstances and conditions just alluded to as well as the rules of grammar. For it must not be forgotten, to use the words of the venerable Bishop of Fredericton, that "Inspiration controls and modifies the thoughts, but does not alter the character, of the mind which is inspired." With Dr. Lightfoot, then, the Epistles of the Apostle of the Gentiles are something more than a *hortus siccus* of grammatical and verbal specimens to be duly ticketed, inscribed, and laid away in their appropriate receptacles.

To illustrate what we mean: In commenting on that passage in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians which has so racked the wits of writers who have attempted to explain its construction, the passage, namely, in which St. Paul is speaking of the case of Titus, Dr. Lightfoot gives up the grammar as hopeless, and seeks help

elsewhere. On the entire passage he says, "St. Paul is here distracted between the fear of saying too much and the fear of saying too little. . . . In this conflict of aims and feelings the sense of the passage is well-nigh lost. . . . From this shipwreck of grammar it is difficult to extricate the main incident." And again on v. 4 ("and that because of false brethren, etc.") he says, "at this point the connection of the sentence is snapped. . . . The counsels of the Apostles of the Circumcision are the hidden rock on which the grammar of the sentence is wrecked." On this same verse another commentator well learned, but very verbal, says, "The construction here is not perfectly perspicuous, but it does not appear necessary either to regard it as a positive anacoluthon, or an anacoluthon arising from two blended constructions." Who does not at once feel the world-wide difference between these two modes of exposition? Of course grammar and verbal criticism have their own important place in the exegesis of Holy Scripture. But a good many other things are required to make a living interpreter of a living word: and these other things Dr. Lightfoot had.

Much more might be said, but we must close this imperfect tribute to a truly great man; great in the simplicity of his godly life; great in his abundant alms-giving, great in the intellectual gifts which God had given him; great in his acquired learning; greatest of all in his deep and unfeigned humility, in his lowly estimation of himself. If we cannot say of him as Milton said of Lycidas that he is "dead, dead ere his prime," may we not say "he hath not left his peer"?

From *The Standard of the Cross and the Church* (Episcopalian), Philadelphia, Jan. 11, 1890.

It has been a long fortnight that we have been awaiting on this side the ocean something more than the bare announcement of the death and burial of the lamented theologian and prelate, Dr. Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham. The bereavement of the American part of the lettered and Christian world has been aggravated not a little by the unaccountable silence of the cable despatches of our secular press correspondents upon this great loss. But whatever the incompetence of some, and the unfortunate negligence of others of these telegraphic authorities, the suspense is now broken by the arrival of English mails, bringing the appreciative utterances of able minds through press and pulpit. The loss is universally and gener-

ally recognized by scholars as that of the foremost of their brotherhood. Our London correspondent recites what Canon Liddon said of the departed Bishop in a sermon the day following his death, as well as the high estimate of his scholarship pronounced by the *London Times*. The *Guardian* says: "The Church of England can ill afford to lose one in whom critical and patriotic scholarship of the highest order was combined with eminent devotion to the work of his Diocese and singular beauty of character."

Joseph Barber Lightfoot was born April 13th, 1828, at Liverpool, a younger son of Mr. John Jackson Lightfoot, accountant, of that city. His earliest education was at the school connected with the Royal Institution in Liverpool, and afterward at the grammar school then under Dr. J. Prince Lee, afterward first Bishop of Manchester. "Here," says the *Manchester Guardian*, "Lightfoot formed one of a trio of remarkable boys—'three boys,' it is said, 'Prince Lee loved more than any one else in the world, and in whom he took every human interest in pushing forward'—the other two being the present Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Benson) and Dr. Brooke Foss Westcott. In 1854 he was ordained by his old Birmingham master, Bishop Prince Lee, at St. John's Church, Heaton Mersey."

He was graduated with highest honors from Trinity College, Cambridge, and became a Fellow of Trinity in 1852. In 1861 he became Hulsean Professor of Divinity, and in 1875 Margaret Professor. In 1871 he was appointed Canon Residentiary at St. Paul's Cathedral. Says the *Times*: "His name will always be cherished in that cathedral as one of its great ornaments. His influence there was of the utmost value, as he brought the gifts of his unsurpassed learning to the work of the practical instruction of a great London audience." But it was his influence and energy in the university life of Cambridge that this journal accounts of incalculable importance. The account continues:

"The peculiar service which was rendered by him and the 'Cambridge School' was that, instead of opposing a mere dogmatic opposition to the Tübingen critics, they met them frankly at once on their own ground; and instead of arguing that their conclusions ought not to be and could not be true, they simply proved that their facts and their premises were wrong.

"Dr. Lightfoot, when once engaged in an inquiry such as that respecting the Epistles of St. Ignatius, pushed his researches into

every field and corner of learning connected with the subject, and would not rest till every circumstance had been investigated which could throw light upon it. This unwearying and fastidious conscientiousness has no doubt been rewarded by the permanence of his work; but it has had one consequence which must forever be regretted. It was one of the causes which prevented the completion of the Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles. The earliest of this great series of commentaries—that on the Epistle to the Galatians—was published in 1865. This was followed in 1868 by a Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, and in 1875 by a Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon; and there, alas! this invaluable series came to a close.

“In 1879 he accepted the Bishopric of Durham. The appointment has been eminently justified by the result. The Bishop never ceased his learned labors, and his grand work on the Ignatian Epistles was completed amidst the discharge of his diocesan duties. But he devoted himself with unstinted energy to the practical work of his see, and soon became beloved and trusted throughout his Diocese for the impulse and support which he gave to every good work. His munificence was understood to be unbounded, and one of his last acts was to build a church at Sunderland as a thank-offering for what every one hoped was his recovery from illness last year. His name will be held in the highest honor as long as the English Church lasts—or rather as long as any Church lasts in which English or European theology is known.”

Bishop Lightfoot was never married. His death occurred at Bournemouth Saturday, December 21st, 1889. The funeral was at Durham Cathedral, Friday, St. John's Day, and the interment at Auckland Castle.

From *Zion's Herald* (Methodist), Boston, Jan. 8, 1890.

PERHAPS no member of the episcopate of the Established Church of England of late years has won for himself a wider and more lasting fame in the great commonwealth of sacred letters, or imposed a stronger obligation on the gratitude of Christian scholars, than the late Bishop of Durham. It is difficult to measure the extent or duly estimate the value of the service he has rendered to the royal science of theology in the several departments of apologetics, hermeneutics and historical criticism during a life less re-

markable for its length than for its exemplary industry and fruitfulness.

For more than two centuries the ancient University of Cambridge has cherished a pardonable pride in the name of Lightfoot. Just as Trinity to-day glories in the exalted piety, the thorough scholarship and the enduring achievements of John Barber Lightfoot, so Christ's claims association with the brilliant renown of the author of the *Hora Hebraica et Talmudica*, who was educated there two centuries and a half ago and subsequently became master of Catharine's Hall and afterwards vice-chancellor of the University. The earlier Lightfoot was one of the ablest and confessedly the most learned of the many distinguished men who sat in the Westminster Assembly of divines and who formulated that noblest of post-Reformation symbols—the “Westminster Confession of Faith,” whose days now appear to be numbered. His intimate and thorough knowledge of rabbinical literature was remarkable for his day, though far surpassed by many advanced Hebraists in our own time.

The University of Cambridge has never shared the notoriety of Oxford as the source of great movements in the religious life and thought of England. In the long list of eminent men she has given to the world she cannot point to a Wesley or a Newman. Her influence on theological thought and learning has been of a quieter and more conservative and probably deeper kind. Oxford has been like an old hen hatching young eagles unawares, and when the birds fostered by her maternal wing have developed their pinions and begun to soar, she has been astonished, if not alarmed, at their strange and unexpected movements. Methodism, the creation (humanly speaking) of the greatest of her sons, she has never understood, and probably never will. Nor has she been less perplexed with the less praiseworthy and less permanent work of Pusey, Keble, and John Henry Newman. Cambridge has at least understood the most eminent of her children; has watched their distinguished careers with undisguised approval, and with a just maternal pride holds their names in enduring honor. Not the least of these was Dr. John Barber Lightfoot. Born in the city of Liverpool in 1828, he graduated from Trinity College in 1851, was the following year elected fellow, took orders in 1854, and in 1857 became tutor of his college. Four years later he was appointed honorary chaplain to the Queen and Hulsean professor of divinity in the University. A few years later he became examin-

ing chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury; in 1871 a canon residentiary of St. Paul's Cathedral; and a few years subsequently, after considerable hesitation, accepted appointment to the bishopric of Durham.

The claims of an English diocese to-day on the time and energies of its overseer are far more imperative, exacting and continuous than they used to be before Nonconformity acquired its present political influence and animus, and the Liberation Society began to direct its artillery against the ancient stronghold of the Establishment; and when the Church of England claimed Dr. Lightfoot's labors as a bishop, it was feared that the larger church outside the sectional one would lose his invaluable labors as a skilled and scholarly exegete, polemic and theologian. That fear has not been justified. Both his work on the "Ignatian Epistles" and his recently published reply to the "great unknown" whose anonymous work on "Supernatural Religion" created for a time such an unwarranted sensation in the theological world a few years ago, have appeared since his elevation. Many of the more flagrant and obvious errors and misstatements of that pretentious critic of historical Christianity had already met with masterly overhauling and merciless exposure at the hands of Dr. Lightfoot's life-long friend, the venerable Dr. Brooke Foss Westcott of Trinity College, in the lengthy preface to the fourth edition of his "History of the Canon of the New Testament." "It would scarcely be worth while to refer to the startling mis-translations of Greek and Latin which occur from time to time," says Dr. Westcott, "if the author did not most justly insist on the necessity of rigorous exactness." "The author of 'Supernatural Religion,'" he continues, "strives, I doubt not, to be fair; but in spite of an ostentation of justice, he falls into errors of fact far more frequently than an accurate scholar (as I believe) could do." The leading points assailed by the anonymous critic are vigorously defended by Westcott, but many points of minor consequence are left unnoticed. Dr. Lightfoot's book takes a wider scope, and is an examination—critical, complete, exhaustive—of the entire field of debate.

In the death of the great scholar cautious and conservative criticism has lost one of its most skilful and most capable leaders; evangelical theology has lost one of its truest friends and one of its ablest exponents; the Church of England has lost one of its brightest ornaments, and the church universal one of its most catholic-spirited members.

Though a loyal son of the English Church, his fine critical instinct, to say nothing of his sense of fairness and his love of truth, withheld him from sanctioning the miserable old figment of apostolic succession, or claiming the exclusive sanction of divine authority, for episcopacy. His fine dissertation on "St. Paul and Seneca" exhibits the largeness of his soul as well as his unerring critical sagacity, while that on the "Christian Ministry" shows how impossible it was for him "to give to a party what was meant for mankind."

CHRIST A POOR MAN.

BY PHILLIPS BROOKS, D.D.

From *The Central Christian Advocate* (Methodist), St. Louis, Dec. 25, 1889.

THE Christ of Christmas Day at His birth and through all His life was poor. That fact we know full well. The picture on the pages of the Gospel with which our eyes are so familiar never lets us forget it. There it always is—the humble company shut out of the great caravansary as insignificant people and finding their place among the cattle; the perfect destitution of all the things which make life splendid or even comfortable; the carpenter's shop, the long foot journeys, the "not having where to lay His head." We know it all; and yet sometimes it comes back to us with something almost like discovery and surprise. Was it then true? Did that which all men are accepting as the pattern life come into the world, and go through the world, and go out of the world, without a single sign of any care about those things which the great mass of men are struggling after as if there could be no joy in life without them? Let a stranger come here and see our business world. Let him walk through our business streets, and be told that this is a Christian city and these are Christian men. Let him watch their anxious faces. Let him listen to their feverish talk. Let him read the bulletins which they are devouring with hungry eyes. Let him get thoroughly into the soul of this determined, furious pursuit of wealth, and then let him suddenly be told that the great Master of these men, He after whose name almost all of them want to be called, never had any and never wanted to have any of this wealth to the pursuit of which all these men's lives are given; must he not be surprised? Ah! how vulgar and poor it makes the hunt for money seem! How it ought to break some of these heavy chains! It is

not necessary that you should be rich. There is no need of it whatever. Behold, He who struck the highest, purest note of human life, He who showed God to man, He who brought man to God, He who redeemed the world—He was not rich, but poor. O blessed fact! What if it had been a rich man that had saved the world? How, conspiring with all man's native passion to be rich, the sight of the Rich Redeemer would have enlisted all our best ambitions in the struggle for the money which must then have come to seem indispensable for the best life and work! How terrible that would have been! Heaven and hell almost confederate to make the soul of man the slave to gold! But now how different! Now the life of Christ may be misread into a false glorification of poverty, but it never can be made to preach cupidity. Now he who reads the story of Christ's life knows that to be rich is not, and never can be, the worthy object of a human life. He who reads that story despises his own passion for money. He feels dropping out of his heart his base and brutal contempt for the poor man. And the poor man himself fills his soul with self-respect and strength beside the cradle of the poor Jesus. Oh, my dear friends! is it not true that poor and rich, in themselves and toward each other, can never be what they ought to be so long as to both money seems to be the one desirable thing in life? If that be so, must not the first leaf from the tree which is for the healing of the nations come in this fact, that the Son of man—the Man of men, the Man who lived the richest life this world has ever seen—was born and lived and died in poverty?

A FORGOTTEN DISTINCTION.

BY PROFESSOR A. S. COATS.

From *The Standard* (Baptist), Chicago, Jan. 16, 1890.

"WHAT difference it makes whether one 'believes Jesus' or 'believes in Jesus' much thought has not enabled me to discover." One hardly knows at which fact to express the greater surprise—the ignorance as thus expressed by Professor Huxley of the most obvious, most fundamental, most heaven-high, hell-deep distinction in New Testament Christianity, which he undertakes in several numbers of *The Nineteenth Century* for 1889 so learnedly to discuss, or the failure of his equally learned antagonist, Henry Wace, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral, and principal of King's College,

London, to enlighten him as to that distinction. It is owing to this failure and this failure alone, that the undignified controversy between these two champions of Agnosticism and Christianity respectively was waged with such varying fortunes through six numbers of the *Century*, and that at its close the friends of either side found it possible with almost equal propriety to claim the victory.

Dr. Wace, at the Manchester church congress, 1888, read a paper in which he asserted: "It is and ought to be an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly that he does not believe Jesus Christ." He further asserted that though such a man "may prefer to call himself an agnostic, his real name is an older one—he is an infidel." Professor Huxley, who so far as the word "infidel" is concerned prefers the game without the name, while he is even more anxious that the world should not forget that though he did not invent agnosticism he at least named it, feels himself personally affronted by this designation "infidel," since he and his prefer the title "agnostic." Thus the battle begins. In Professor Huxley's first onset he says: "It is and it ought to be," authoritatively declares this official representative of Christian ethics (Dr. Wace), 'an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly that he does not believe in Jesus Christ.' This he interprets as meaning: that honest disbelief in their (the churches') more or less astonishing creeds is a moral offence, indeed, a sin of the deepest dye, deserving and involving the same future retribution as murder and robbing." Dr. Wace in reply virtually admits that belief in Jesus Christ may be taken as equivalent to belief "of the Christian creed as a whole," while he shows that he was not referring to such belief at all, "but to Jesus Christ as a person, and regarded as a witness to certain primary truths which an Agnostic will not accept."

What different reading should we have had if Dr. Wace had seen fit to show the valiant champion of theological know-nothingism, at this point, that belief in Jesus Christ, while it is in no sense synonymous with belief in the creeds of the church, is also a vastly, a fundamentally different thing from believing "Jesus Christ as a person and regarded as a witness to certain primary truths which an agnostic will not acknowledge!" Had he chosen to show this learned heathen, whom "much thought" has not enabled to see "what difference it makes whether one believes Jesus or believes in Jesus," what it is "to believe in Jesus," he

would naturally have had recourse to some such line of argument as the Master used in his interview with the learned Jew, Nicodemus: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak that we do know and bear witness to that we have seen and ye receive not our witness. If I told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you heavenly things?" Or he might with equal propriety have shown this modern unregenerated Saul of Tarsus, who with more modern but none the less effective weapons persecutes the Church of God and makes havoc of it, how his greater prototype was engaged in exactly the same business until, as he says, "It was the good pleasure of God to reveal his Son in me." How that then and there his eyes were opened; and he "was not disobedient to the heavenly vision; but declared both to them of Damascus first, and at Jerusalem and throughout all the country of Judea and also to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, doing works worthy of repentance." This would naturally have led him to refer to the way that this same Saul—now a new man in Christ Jesus with a new name—dealt with the wise agnostics of Greece: "For the word of the cross is to them that are perishing foolishness; but unto us which are being saved it is the power of God. . . . For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe. . . . As it is written:

'Things which eye saw not and ear heard not,
And which entered not into the heart of man,
Whatsoever things God prepared for them that
love him.'

but unto us God revealed them through the Spirit. . . . Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, and he cannot know them because they are spiritually judged, but he that is spiritual judgeth all things." If further testimony were needed he would probably have turned to that of the beloved disciple: "This is the message which we have heard from him and announced unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. . . . If we walk in the light as he is in the light we have fellowship one with another and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin. . . .

And hereby know we that we know him if we keep his commandments."

In a word, had Dr. Wace seen fit to show Professor Huxley "what difference it makes whether one believes Jesus or believes in Jesus," he would have been led to discover to him the New Testament doctrine of the new birth. He would have been led to show him that Christianity does not simply claim to be a supernatural religion, but that it also demands in man, and offers to man a supernatural enlightenment in order to its understanding. This is what may be called the New Testament short method in dealing with agnostics, and this is the only method the New Testament sanctions. Would it have cut short the now famous Wace-Huxley controversy very soon after it had begun to drag its weary course through the first six months of 1889? Granted, and also that Professor Huxley and all the indifference of the age that gladly hides its lazy head under the word agnosticism, would have met such a turn in the controversy with a loud guffaw. Even this were far better than to carry to the world the idea which the world so eagerly welcomes, that unbelief is an intellectual, not a moral disease, and that to be convinced of the truth of the Christian religion is to be a Christian. The devils have no doubt of the truth of Christianity, but they make and live lies instead. Had Dr. Wace succeeded in his ill-advised attempt, in convincing Professor Huxley of the historical, supernatural character of New Testament religion, he would not necessarily have brought him any nearer the kingdom of heaven than he found him. Such is the immense difference between believing Jesus and believing in Jesus.

AMERICAN CHURCHMANSHIP AND CHURCH UNITY.

From *The Living Church* (Episcopalian), Chicago, Jan. 18, 1890.

IN a former article we have shown what is meant by the special claims of the Episcopal Church, and why, in making overtures towards unity, she has been obliged to reserve and insist upon certain fundamental points. We have seen that from her own point of view this position is not a matter of her own choosing, but grows necessarily out of her organization and nature. She finds herself in possession of an organization with a fixed character which has descended to her from the holy Apostles, with certain unchangeable features, and an unvarying

method of transmission: This organization includes also an unchangeable Faith and certain institutions, which it is her duty to preserve to the end of time.

The question between the Episcopal Church and the Christian denominations is not so much concerned with this or that mode of Church government, episcopal or other; but the real question to be determined is this, whether or not Christ and His Apostles founded an organization to exist visibly in the world, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail, which is destined to continue until the end of all things, and which, therefore, has been clothed with the power of self-perpetuation. If this question be answered in the affirmative, then it is a mere truism that such a Church is a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, and that it hath "authority" in matters of faith. Moreover, from the divine character of such a body, the permanent institutions which it preserves and celebrates derive a force and authority which no mere recent arrangements in imitation of the letter of Holy Scripture could ever claim without some sign from heaven.

But if it be insisted that no such visible organization was established by Christ or those who acted under His commission, it follows irresistibly that none exists now. There is then no organization calling itself a Church which can claim the allegiance of men. None can assume any such authority unless it has been received from above. Nor will a union of all existing denominations advance this matter one step. If no one of the present divisions of Christianity has any divine claim upon the allegiance of men, if none possesses those essentials of which we have spoken, then the union or fusion of them all cannot create an authority which did not exist before. No human arrangement can establish a divine right.

There may, of course, be very strong reasons why men who have at heart the extension of the moral and spiritual teachings of the Gospel and the perpetual memory of the Life and Passion of Christ should join such a body; but if it seem to any man or set of men that they can do the same thing better apart from such a body, they cannot be condemned. It is a human, not a divine institution, which invites them, and therefore it cannot speak with authority. To give up the principle of authority is not to abolish the sect spirit but to encourage it. A union based upon sentimental and utilitarian grounds can only appeal to men upon those grounds. It must set forth its merits and its advantages, but it can urge no higher

claim. The very principles upon which it is based compel it to dwell upon its own merits and virtues, its economy, its missionary enterprise and efficiency, its brotherly love and charity, its devotion—a state of things which tends inevitably to hypocrisy and Pharisaism.

The spirit of the Church which rests upon divine institution is the opposite of this. While it is made up of weak and erring men, the very fact that they have so wonderful and precious a trust laid upon them, must needs make their own incapacity more glaring, and deepen the sense of humility in all thoughtful minds. They will not feel inclined to make prominent and glory in those features of the visible Church which are merely of man's contriving—missionary boards, guilds, brotherhoods and sisterhoods, missions, retreats, and the like. The constant vigilance necessary to render these agencies efficient and to prevent them from degenerating into a positive abuse or injury to the cause they are meant to aid, is too sadly apparent to all who have had even a brief experience. But they will feel bold to appeal to that which was not the work of men's hands, to that which they have not created but received, to the Church of the living God, "the pillar and ground of the truth."

It is here, therefore, that the real importance of those fundamental points upon which the bishops, in their now famous declaration, have taken their stand, becomes apparent. They have not retained in their irenicism one single point which it was possible for them to give up. The things which we insist upon, they would say, are not ours, they are a sacred trust, the essentials of the Gospel of Christ as we have received it. To all who would persuade them to yield anything here, they are forced to say: *Non possumus*.

The intelligent reader will readily see that it is in no self-righteous or arrogant spirit that this Church has proposed its terms of union; on the contrary, the attitude of the bishops is one of the loftiest charity.

In any united "Church of the Future," unless there is some basis of divine authority, the union can in the nature of things be only transitory and must in the end be futile. It must be able to claim the allegiance of men, to speak with the voice of authority, as the representative of Christ on earth, or it will inspire no real respect and have no lasting mission in the world. At this juncture the bishops by their declaration have made clear to the Christian world the difficulty which lies in the way of all

human schemes of reunion, and have pointed out the only way to true and lasting unity. It is not, therefore, the pre-eminence of the Episcopal Church on its human side, which is at stake, but the effective character of the united body, and its power to call upon men with an authoritative voice.

CHRIST, THE BREAD OF LIFE.

BY REV. JOHN M'DOWELL LEAVITT, D.D.,
LL.D.

From *The Episcopal Recorder* (Reformed Episcopalian),
Philadelphia, Dec. 26, 1889.

How strange the history of a loaf of bread ! The soft, white flour comes from a seed torn by plough and harrow. Even before the green leaf rose above the earth, its germ was exposed to the claws and beaks of birds, to be blighted by frost and swept by flood. When the harvest was ripe, iron reaped the yellow grain, and iron too threshed it. Mill-stones ground it into powder. Bitter leaven mingles with the flour, which feels the fire before it reaches the table.

Now the bread enters the body of man, and flowing through his blood, nourishes this strange human growth. Invisible particles are incorporated with bone and sinew and muscle. They become portions of the very heart, as it pulsates them through the system. By minute tubes they are borne to the tips of the fingers, and of the hair. They minister to the brain, supplying those delicate and mysterious organs which are connected with the soul, and which are thus related to passion, to will, to thought, to moral agency, and all the sublime possibilities of man's everlasting future. Bread feeds the hunger of the world, bread feeds the heart of the world, bread feeds the brain of the world. In this pilgrimage of earth, bread helps us to heaven.

Jesus, too, from manger to cross was torn, was bruised, was broken. The star of Bethlehem shone over a lowly birthplace, to toil and poverty and a cross. Our Saviour through all His mission was ploughed and harrowed by hate. Like birds of prey, men and demons sought His destruction. He resembled the seed cut with iron, ground by stone, exposed to fire. But by this very process, He became for man the bread of everlasting life. Only by allying itself to our mortal human flesh could Godhead appease our immortal human hunger. Who-soever feeds by faith on Him is satisfied for time and eternity. He meets every want in a soul. Meat, indeed, His flesh ! drink, indeed, His blood ! These symbols transport us to the heart of redemption and experi-

ence. The centre of all doctrine and of all piety is that faith in the death of Jesus—our Incarnate God and Creator—which seals to us the forgiveness of our sins, brings to us the regeneration of our souls, and assures us of the life everlasting.

How beautiful the lesson taught by the multiplication of the loaves ! Jesus left the shore of Galilee, and ascended a mountain, perhaps in view of the exquisite lake. The multitude follow. See men and women and children sitting together on the green grass ! Jesus does not despise their human hunger. He converts it into an immortal lesson. Under His Divine touch, one of our lowest animalistic wants becomes a teacher forever. Five loaves by His omnipotence are multiplied to feed five thousand. And there is a generous remainder of baskets of fragments ! Touching and exquisite picture of Jesus as the infinite and exhaustless satisfaction of man's spiritual hunger ! By the anticipation of faith, patriarchs and prophets lived on Him. Apostles and martyrs lived on Him. Millions since have lived on Him. Down to the end of time innumerable multitudes will live on Him. And He will be their feast forever ! Through the eternal years of heaven, Jesus will be the everlasting banquet of His redeemed.

There is a deep meaning in that promise to the Christians at Pergamos, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the *hidden manna*." We are transported back through centuries to the wilderness. What sparkles like frost over the earth ? Have the dews been congealed into those glittering crystals ? No ! It is the bread Jehovah sends from heaven during forty years to Israel. Moses deposits a portion within the vail, in the ark, next the law, beneath the mercy seat, covered by the wings of the cherubim, and the cloud of the Divine glory. This is the "*hidden*" manna. It was made directly by Jehovah, and preserved in the holiest by His command.

Our daily bread is the symbol of Jesus as He supports our daily life, and is the food of our earthly pilgrimage. But beyond the vail of death, on the throne of the temple of the universe, He is as yet to us the "*hidden*" manna. Hereafter in heaven He will be the everlasting bread, reserved for us, His celestial and immortal guests.

CHILDREN FOR LEADERS.

From *The St. Louis Christian Advocate* (Methodist), Dec. 26,
1889.

It is notorious that the young people in many places are giving direction and tone to

the church life; their societies, their leadership are conspicuous. Is this best? Can children be leaders? Is the spirit engendered by young life, the spirit of sobriety, of reverence? Can there be solidity in such direction? The pastor makes a sad mistake who does not use his utmost care to save the young; the mistake is scarcely less serious and more far-reaching to turn the reins of control over to the young. The element of humility and obedience are not in leadership, but in following. The young are to be trained under the direction of those who, by reason of their age and training, have been schooled in the sober virtues of spiritual leadership.

The spirit native to young folks is not the spirit that should form church sentiment or challenge church leadership. Let the young be led by the training hand of age, and experience, and wisdom.

Rhoboaam made no more fatal mistake when he rejected the counsels of the old and tried leaders of his father, for the spirit and freshness of young counsel, than the church does in making the young their leaders. Reverence is not in young hearts; experience, maturity, wisdom are not there. The prophesied woful day to Israel would be when women and children were their leaders.

THE WEAK POINT IN A GREAT WORK.

From *The Examiner* (Baptist), New York, Jan. 9, 1890.

AN Episcopal rector in Brooklyn has recently taken the radical step of abolishing the Sunday-school in his church. He claims that the Episcopal church never intended to have any Sunday-schools. Personally he believes they are mischievous on account of the incompetency and ignorance of many teachers. He compares the religious instruction of children in such schools to the care of a valuable horse by a person not thoroughly versed in stable duties, and deplors the injustice to which the children's souls are thus subjected. To take the place and to avoid the evils of Sunday-schools he conducts himself a catechism class every Sunday afternoon for both children and adults.

Mr. Ruskin somewhere speaks of the danger of taking from the strength of strong things by saying them too strongly. The Brooklyn rector has certainly fallen into this error in his criticism of the Sunday-school. He forgets or ignores the immense good which has been done by Sunday schools. He takes no account of their social force. He makes nothing of the opportunities they

give for personal religious influence. He overstates the defects he has seen in them, and can find no remedy but dispensing with them altogether. It is not surprising that this action has alienated several of the more active members of his church. In spite of his opposition, Sunday-school classes continue to gather in the homes of teachers to whom they have become attached, and it is likely soon to become a question whether the rector or the Sunday-school shall "go."

Notwithstanding the extravagance and folly of a step like this, there is enough of truth in the charge which was made to justify it to deserve thoughtful attention. The most earnest supporters of the Sunday-school feel most strongly that its weak point is the difficulty of having capable teachers. We remember hearing an eloquent speaker at a convention descant in glowing terms upon the ideal perfection of Bible study and expository preaching as seen in a Sunday-school class, where scholars are grouped about a teacher and each can be individually guided. Alas! the system fails to fulfil the ideal because the ideal teacher is lacking. A pastor lately had occasion to take a class that had been taught for years by a leading man in his church. He found them without knowledge of the simplest Bible facts. They had never heard of any Joseph but the husband of Mary. Their religious ideas were generally nebulous in the extreme. This was by no means an exceptional case. It could be paralleled in most Sunday-schools.

The trouble is not easy to deal with. Volunteer teachers cannot be criticised and held to their work as salaried teachers are in other schools. The most incompetent are the most self-complacent. It is the experience of pastors and superintendents who have carried on teachers' meetings that the teachers in greatest need of training could seldom be induced to attend. Some Sunday-school specialists have gone so far as to advocate hiring teachers. We do not believe the problem can be solved in that way. But when we consider that the Sunday-school supplies all the religious instruction received nowadays by a large part of the children of Protestant families, nothing is more important than to secure its highest efficiency.

THE DISCOURAGING BROTHER.

From *The Central Baptist*, St. Louis, Jan. 9, 1890.

THERE is one office it is no honor to fill. The one who fills it most completely is least

deserving of honor. We refer to the office of religious brakeman, habitual discourager, general depressing agent and enemy of sanctified enthusiasm. It is commonly supposed that success and happiness in Christian service depend on hopefulness, cheerfulness and good spirits. This frame of mind has been found most friendly to every good undertaking and on good terms with hard work. Good-natured, buoyant souls are never around candidating for the position of brakeman, but aspire to a place near the engine and in partnership with the source of power.

But there are a few, and we are glad they are but few, who find it more agreeable to their nature to put a check on the fervor of their brethren. They stand with willing hands on the brake, ready at the first appearance of quickened speed to give the wheel a few vigorous turns to hold things back from too rapid progress. They are afraid affairs will run off. They are in mental dread of a wreck. They are set for a defence against down grades. Everything seems to them to be heading towards a precipice, and on them alone is laid the power or wisdom to avert impending ruin. It can be said of some of them that they are faithful to their assumed responsibilities.

This office does not demand a very high order of talents in its incumbents. It is filled by the humbler class of talents. Indeed too much mental capacity and largeness of ideas are seriously in the way of effectiveness. A little bit of skill added to a strong disposition in that direction is sufficient. One who could not hope for distinction in any other calling has been known to amount to a positive and successful paralyzer to a whole church in some good work. This icy brother is not heard for his eloquence or felt for his much power; it is his low temperature that does the work. The modern scheme of making ice under a tropical sun is but a poor imitation of the brother we are describing. He is the original, genuine patent; all others are base imitations.

The prayer-meeting furnishes a fine field for this restrainer of feeling. Just as the brethren are beginning to grow ardent over the full attendance and the promptness of those who take part, it is his opportunity to suggest in a long metre speech that it is a sad comment on our religion that not half of the members are present, and that comparatively few of those present give evidence of intelligent faith. He soon reduces the temperature from boiling to freezing. You see there are so many weak places in the ordinary church that he can make every

stroke tell. There are so many openings that the chilling winds soon fill the place. He is a success. He kills the next prayer-meeting by killing this.

When the revival season is at hand and there is a quickened religious feeling prevalent, our brother magnifies his office. He preaches that excitement is the great foe of genuine conversion, and that as serious and reasonable a matter as religion ought to be entered upon deliberately, coolly, intelligently. Unfortunately he can illustrate his theory by many a conspicuous example of noisy professions terminating in a falling off into violent unbelief. He favors a quiet work of grace. He has studied his speech a year, and gets it off at a time when its cooling effect will be most felt.

If the subject is that of missions to any particular locality or people, and if it is calling out a blaze of interest, it is very easy for him to divert attention to some other field and break up the intensity of interest. Why pray and give for the conversion of China while there are several hundred people in hearing of the church who are not converted! Why send money away for any object of benevolence while the church finds it hard to raise money for its own expenses! It is a doubtful benevolence to aid in the education of ministers while there are examples of beneficiaries who never amounted to anything, and of self-educated men who rose to highest distinction. Just a few facts like these and a small lump of ice upon them will do the work for any warm interest in ministerial education.

If a neighboring mission appeals for help, somebody can speak truthfully and say that it is not wisely located, or that it has not been well managed, or that another church ought to provide for its support. You may depend on our skilled reducer of temperature to come in at the right time with a few objections that he keeps on hand, and when he gets through he has turned the tropics into winter. The stream of benevolence freezes at higher temperature than any other stream in this climate.

The brakeman is not a bad man to have aboard the train. We feel safer to know that he is along and that he understands the signals. But you don't want him to go ahead to the locomotive, cut off steam and shut the whole train down. We need him at the steep down grades and at the stations. It is a saving of time to have his services. But if he is forever twisting that old wheel and fighting the engineer and causing the train to fall behind the time table, he is a positive detriment.

We like the cautious, cool brother, who keeps us supplied with ice, but we do not want ice in the furnace and everywhere else. In religion we like to see a good degree of heat.

CURING THE FAITH CURE.

From *The Christian Union*, New York, Jan. 1, 1890.

WE have small sympathy with what is known as the Faith Cure. The essential principle of the faith cure is, Use no medicine yourself, but trust in God to heal you. We believe that this is bad theology in the spiritual world and bad medicine in the material world—no better in the one than in the other. Faith in God is best shown by using the means which he has put in our power and then trusting in him. Cromwell's motto is the best embodiment of faith—"Trust in God and keep your powder dry." We have, therefore, no defence to make for those fanatics who refuse to take medicine themselves or give it to their children, and expect that God will miraculously heal them in answer to prayer.

But we gravely doubt the wisdom, not to say the rightfulness, of arresting and imprisoning such fanatics. If, indeed, society finds sick children neglected by their parents, for whatever reason or with whatever excuse, it may take the children from the neglecting parents and provide for them itself. That right we do not question—nay, we vigorously affirm. But the right of society to punish a man for not taking the right kind of medicine, or not taking any medicine at all, or for refusing to give it to his wife or his child, is another matter. If society may determine that prayer will not heal, and punish a man for administering prayer, why may it not determine that allopathic remedies will not heal, and punish him for administering allopathic remedies? The individual has some rights which the majority are bound to respect. To attempt to compel a man to pursue the course of healing which the majority think right is carrying sumptuary legislation beyond the bounds to which it was ever carried by Puritan or Hebrew. We doubt whether its parallel is to be found even in the legislation of the French Revolution. The blood of the martyrs is the seed of more than the church. If we want to feed the fires of fanaticism, we can scarcely invent a better way than by putting half a dozen faith-cure-ists in prison for not giving their wives and children the medical treatment which is common in the community. If some people

die for want of drugs, a great many die because of them. If society will take precautionary measures to protect children from the ignorance or the religious enthusiasm of their parents or guardians, it will carry protective measures as far as it can carry them with safety or advantage. In the long run the best way to correct the errors of the faith-cure-ists is to let them try the faith cure and suffer the consequences.

GOLDEN RULE LEGENDS.

ST. BRIGHTSIDES.

A STORY OF THE INFLUENZA EPIDEMIC OF 1841.

From *The Golden Rule*, Boston, Jan. 8, 1890.

ST. BRIGHTSIDES had the grippe; there was no doubt about it. The intolerable headache, the backache, the smarting eyes, the cold chills, the consumptive-like cough, all combined to make it plain to the mind of the wife of St. Brightsides that her husband had the genuine influenza from the far East. "Now," said his consort to herself, "if all accounts are true, I shall hear plenty of fretful and lugubrious wails from this usually cheerful spouse of mine, for they say that even a saint can't help complaining when this disease tortures him. When he had the typhoid-fever, to be sure, he found comfort in the fact that it wasn't the small-pox; and when he broke his arm he found real joy in the recollection that it was his left and not his right arm that was broken; and when all four of the children had the measles at the same time he found wonderful satisfaction in the thought that they did not have the diphtheria. But people do say that, while it lasts, nothing else so prompts to suicide as the grippe. I wonder how he will comfort himself now." Thus soliloquized the wife of St. Brightsides as she bustled about, getting him some beef tea and a hot-water bottle for his feet, and other creature comforts. "If he is like himself, however, he'll be sure to have something cheerful to say," she added.

And, sure enough, as she opened his door, though he was wrestling at the time in the grip of his morning headache, he cried out, "How fortunate it is, Martha, my dear, that this pestilence comes only once in about forty years! I'm fifty years old now, and hardly likely to live to see another epidemic."

"Just as I said!" said the wife of St. Brightsides to herself, and at once she re-

corded her husband's bit of optimistic philosophy for the benefit of those who might have the gripe in the pestilence of 1889-90. But alas! St. Brightsides is long since dead, and it is said that no victim in the present generation has found anything hopeful about La Grippe upon which even the shortest legend could be hung.

CLOSING UP ACCOUNTS.

From *The Christian Register* (Unitarian), Boston, Dec. 26, 1889.

In a little town in the southern part of New York State there lives a wise man who rules a community of about nine hundred souls. He dwells with his "boys" in a big stone castle-like structure on the top of a steep hill. In many respects, he is a remarkably stern man; and, when his jaws meet, as they do with a clash sometimes, everybody recognizes a determination as immovable as the granite of ages. His "boys" are young fellows sent to him to be taught obedience to law and better methods of living. On occasions like Thanksgiving Day and Christmas, this wise man has a habit of saying to his most promising children:

"Well, boys, some of you have done well, and some of you haven't done so well. But let us square up accounts, and throw away the bad memories of the past; and let us start all over again."

"Let us start all over again!" The absolute justice of such a proceeding is not something to be argued on strict logical principles, but the wisdom of it is something that has been demonstrated many a time during the past ten years. Little bad boys in school and big worse boys out of school all know how dreary the prospect becomes when one gets saddled with long accumulations of derelict accounts. The days pass by quickly, and each day leaves its little heap of mental and moral debt. By and by, the load assumes mountainous proportions, and the mere contemplation of it produces a sickening sense of the futility of regenerative effort. This wise man has discovered that nothing serves so well to encourage the anxious and fretting struggles as a relief—even if it be almost entirely hypothetical, as relief from the results of one's own wrong-doing always must be—from the galling pack of borrowed and accumulated iniquities.

Nobody ever escaped the effects of wrongdoing in this world. The immutable law of Nature and of Nature's God doesn't permit

the transference and relinquishment of moral debt. This is a fact that cannot be disguised. But the attitude which the creditor assumes is everything. May not the wise Father frequently take somewhat the stand of the indulgent creditor who says: "Of course, your debt is possible of enforcement by legal means. You owe me so much; and you know and I know that you've got to pay it—now or some other time. I can do one of two things: I can grind this debt out of you by systematic torture, or I can make the debt one of honor, and say: 'Let us be friends. You owe me so much—let that matter drop just now. Go about your business. Start all over again. I can't relieve you of your debt, but I can relieve you of anxiety about it. I won't bother you any more. Pay me when you can'?"

This is a very material way of looking at things, and the simile may not strike everybody as the most reverent. Indeed, commercial analogies as applied to God's dealings have been altogether overdone. But the analogy in actual life exists just the same. The wise man in New York says, "Boys, let us start all over again." He does not relieve the young men of the evil fruits of their past transgressions. He does not wipe away any of the stains of misspent life. Nobody can do that but the young men themselves. He simply changes his base; he alters his attitude toward the young sinners. The Father of us all says, "Children, let us close up accounts, and start all over again." He does not relieve us of the effects that still continue of our folly in the past. We are not freed from a debt that must be paid, a debt that we have contracted and must honor. He changes his attitude from that of creditor to that of Friend. Christian's pack still clings to him; but, oh, how much lighter it grows when he catches a glimpse of the kindly beams that welcome him to higher endeavor!

WHY SOME PREACHERS FAIL.

From *The Religious Telescope* (United Brethren), Dayton, O., Jan. 15, 1890.

THAT many preachers do not succeed as they desire is very true. In fact, the most efficient pastors often feel that they do but very little compared with what they would like to do. In so far as this feeling is born of humility and a burdening sense of the many who are yet unsaved, it is not to be deplored. When we are weak in our own

eyes and in our own strength, and so realize our weakness as that it drives us to God, then are we strong.

Many do not succeed for lack of qualification, others for lack of zeal, others again because they "have too many irons in the fire,"—preach, farm, work as agents, etc. The minister to be truly successful must give his mind, his time, his physical energies to the work. Only in this way can he become so acquainted with the people, the situation, and so skilled in the handling of the truth as to effectually apply it to the immediate emergencies.

But there is one cause of failure not named above to which we would call attention. It is a species of self-reliance, prompted by vanity and egotism. We do not pretend to say, that there are many such preachers, but there are at least a few. They have good natural abilities, fine *physique*, have at least a smattering of an education, an easy flow of words, are eloquent and somewhat sensational in speech, and have been told that they are fine pulpit orators. Thus assured, they rely on themselves, and in their pulpit efforts are chiefly interested in displaying their abilities and in producing a fine effect by the exercise of their oratorical powers, and leave Christ away in the background. The result is, the glorification of self at the expense of Christ; and although the people are entranced and laud the orator, conviction is not carried to the hearts of sinners by a plain presentation of Christ and the terrors of the law, the church is not edified, and souls are not saved.

How utterly cold and lifeless is such preaching compared with the plain, blunt, burning words of a Moody or a Spurgeon! With them there is no attempt at oratorical display (and yet they are the most truly eloquent of all orators, for the true orator is the speaker who carries his point), only a plain, earnest presentation of truth, such as edifies saints and causes sinners to tremble.

We knew one of those popular pulpit orators once. He drew large audiences, and his eloquence was the theme of many a conversation. It so happened, many years ago, that his conference assigned him to an important charge in a city. After being there more than a year, he became disheartened because the work did not go. The church was not built up—souls were not saved. One day on meeting a man of great bluntness of speech and of just as great practical common sense, he said, "Brother E., I wish to ask you a question. When I came to this charge I resolved that I would do better

work than ever. I laid aside all my old sermons and prepared new ones. I have studied hard, worked hard, preached better sermons than ever before, and still the work don't go. Now can you tell me why?"

"Do you wish me to tell you?" said Mr. E.

"Of course I do."

"Well, I can do it. It is just this way. You go into your study, work hard, get up fine sermons (you know you can do it), and go into the pulpit and display your eloquence. And Jesus Christ says, 'O Mr. K., you can do that so fine, you don't need my assistance' (He says that, because that's the way you feel); 'you just go ahead yourself.' And you do go ahead, and the trouble is, it is all K. and no Jesus Christ. Put Jesus Christ first in your sermons and let K. be His humble servant, and then you'll succeed."

This was a blunt way of telling it; but never was a nail hit more squarely on the head. It expressed the sense exactly.

My dear brethren in the ministry, remember that only in so far as your sermons exhibit the crucified One and His truth to the people, only in so far may you expect to be instruments in His hands in saving sinners. "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." It is the Son of God, lifted up in the pulpits, not eloquence, that saves sinners.

THE SPIRIT OF THE PURITANS.

From *The Moravian*, Bethlehem, Pa., Jan. 1, 1890.

CHEAP sneers at "blue laws" and so forth are among the most unfortunate signs of the materialistic prosperity of our country, now that we have entered upon the closing decade of the nineteenth century. Whilst there may have been certain applications of the principles which actuated the Puritans, that are no longer adapted to the conditions of our changed life to-day, a grateful posterity ought to reverence the purpose which governed those grand men of the past, and to jealousy preserve all that was essential in their mode of thought and method of approaching national and municipal problems. Their indomitable devotion to right can never become antiquated; and their steadfast adherence to what they believed to be the will of God above and before the grasping of opportunities for sordid gain, is something we of to-day could well afford to have more of. We need to incorporate more of

their spirit into our use of the modern external conveniences and comforts, and more of their sense of accountability to the Divine Ruler in our practical politics. At the recent meeting of the Congregational Club, at Boston, Mass., to commemorate "Forefathers' Day," Dr. Richard S. Storrs held up the character of the Puritans, the results of whose fidelity to principle we now enjoy in the solid prosperity of our land, in words which may well be repeated and remembered. Said he :

"The Puritan had an intense conviction of what is apprehended as truth, but also an intense sense of the authority of righteousness as constituting the imperative law of mankind. Added to this was the assurance of a personal power at the head of the universe, who is working for righteousness and means to make it triumphant in the world, together with a profound sense of the invisible world as the immortal realm of righteousness. Puritanism has its sources and its securities in the sovereign elements of human nature, in the discerning and imperative conscience which affirms right as the ultimate law in the universe of mind, in the intuitive reason which declares the certitude of invisible truth, in that divine side of the soul which is in direct correspondence with its author and which sees the eternal justice and might on the field of human combat more clearly than in the earthquake or in any far-shining figures of the stars. We want not to eulogize their spirit, but to incorporate it into our personal life ; not to put it away from us as something which belongs to the past, but to set it forth anew amid our modern conditions."

THE VIRGIN MOTHER.

From *The Moravian*, Bethlehem, Pa., Dec. 25, 1889.

"BLESSED art thou among women !" was the salutation given to Mary by Gabriel. And surely no one that lives in a Christian land and notes the homage paid to Mary, as the mother of Jesus, can doubt for a moment the fulfilment of Gabriel's prophecy.

Though as Protestants we differ widely and radically from Romanists with regard to the real position of Mary, her powers and prerogatives, yet all Christendom unites in believing that Mary was the holiest woman that ever lived. We have, perhaps, idolized her. Realism, that has robbed us of much we loved in art and literature, would doubtless also clothe Mary with a different

face and expression than those with which they who love and revere her memory have adorned her. But idealism is sometimes truer than realism. Munkacsy's Christ, in his "Christ before Pilate," is a realist's conception. No idealist will ever be satisfied with that picture. Nor can we be satisfied to rank Mary as merely an ordinary Hebrew woman—as some would have us believe. While we cannot, of course, in any way endorse Romish views and superstitions, yet there is something so appealing to human sympathy, so gracious and benignant in the figure and history of Mary, that we cannot but place her on a higher level than that occupied by any other woman.

She was not only virtuous. Doubtless the great majority of Jewish maidens were pure. But she must have been pre-eminently pious. She must have been one of those who looked for the consolation of Israel. She must have been—as far as it is possible for mortal to be—holy in soul and body.

In the strong revulsion of sentiment accompanying the German Reformation it is possible that we Protestants have gone too far in denying homage to the Mother of our Lord.

We do not maintain that divine honors should be paid her : far be it from us to voice such a sentiment ! But do we fully appreciate the beauty and holiness of her character ? Do we give her the honors that she deserves as the Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ ? In many Protestant Churches more honor has been paid to the mothers of kings and presidents than to the mother of the God-man.

Mary is the chief among women. No woman in history, however great and pure and noble, deserves to be ranked with her. She alone was accounted worthy to bear the Saviour of our race. The tremendous responsibilities that rested on her, as the mother of Him who should save His people from their sins, were duly realized by her. Was she not told that a sword should pierce through her heart ?

May we not believe that Mary was more to our Lord than merely the woman that bare Him ? He seems to have loved and revered her. "Son, behold thy mother," was His last commission to His dearest earthly friend, when He bequeathed Mary to John's care.

May we not in this Christmas season lay some sweet garlands at her feet who gave all she was and had to the Saviour of our souls ? Will it not be acceptable to her Son, our Saviour, if in our Christmas joys we forget not to honor her that bare Him ?

THE VALUE OF THE STUDY OF THE CHURCH FATHERS.

BY THE REV. GEORGE T. PURVES, D.D.

From *The Sunday-School Times*, Philadelphia, Jan. 18, 1890.

A NUMBER of books have recently been published, dealing, in a more or less popular way, with the lives and writings of the early Church Fathers, which seem to indicate a freshly awakened interest, among general readers, in this department of Christian literature. Farrar's "Lives of the Fathers," Hemphill's "Diatessaron of Tatian," Mrs. Martin's "Life of St. Jerome," Bigg's "Christian Platonists of Alexandria," though not all of the same quality or grade, are examples of this class of publications. With them we may connect the series of translations of the ante-Nicene Fathers, now being followed by the Nicene and post-Nicene, issued in this country by the Christian Literature Company. The reception accorded to this series of translations shows that it supplied a much-felt need of Protestant Christians. In fact, all kinds of knowledge, whether scientific, or historical, or theological, have in our day been popularized; and, not the least, biblical and religious criticism. The latter, however, has so often occasion to mention and discuss early Christian literature, that probably a greater number of persons than ever before have felt a desire to know something of the men and books whose names are so often met, and whose statements about Scripture and primitive Christianity are so often quoted in current publications.

Of course, more serious work in this department has always been carried on by certain classes of students. Not only have learned Roman Catholics devoted attention to the Fathers, but English, and, more lately, German Protestant scholars, have diligently studied and edited their writings, critically examined and corrected the text given in the manuscripts, and estimated their historical and religious value. Scholars, therefore, have always recognized the importance of this branch of study, both for its own sake and because of its bearings on other departments of theological science. It is the fact of an increased popular interest both among clergy and laity, and beyond the bounds of those churches where such an interest would most naturally be expected, which deserves attention.

The question, therefore, may properly be raised, What is the value, to the general reader, of the study of the Church Fathers? Probably not a few intelligent Protestants

regard it as sheer waste of time. It was very natural for Protestantism to react so far from the false use made of the Fathers by the Roman Church as to neglect them altogether. The Fathers had been raised to the position of religious authorities. At the Reformation their opinions were quoted oftener than the Scriptures. Their teachings were practically raised above those of the apostles, and used to support utterly unscriptural dogmas. It was natural for Protestants, who maintained the sole authority of the Scriptures, to neglect, and even despise, authors who had been made to occupy so false a position.

It was easy also for Protestant writers to bring the Fathers into contempt. Many of their books had been corrupted, and the current text could be shown to be untrustworthy. Many contradictions and absurd conceits and manifest errors could be pointed out in their teaching. They could be quoted against one another on both sides of almost any theological question. In fact, the Protestant reaction against their use was absolutely necessary in order to lead at a later period to a proper estimate of their value. Jean Dailly's work "On the Right Use of the Fathers," published in French in 1631, and still often found in Protestant libraries, was one of a number which, by proving the entire insufficiency of the Fathers as authorities for the Church, prepared the way for a more discriminating and useful study of them.

So long, then, as the Church Fathers were regarded as dogmatic authorities, the study was more mischievous than beneficial. But we now approach them in a wholly different spirit. We are ready to criticise their opinions like those of other writers, to discriminate between the truth and error in their pages, to cross-examine their testimony and weigh their arguments, to discover which of the books assigned to them are genuine and which are spurious,—in short, to study them by the methods of historical criticism, and then to value them for what they may be proved to be worth. So used, the Church Fathers are of very great value to the thoughtful Christian reader. None should be content to be ignorant of men who in their lives and by their writings played important parts in the early progress of Christianity, and are now playing almost equally important parts in the modern study of the Christian origins,—a study which bears directly on the defence of the Christian faith.

To briefly indicate, then, the value of the study of the early Church Fathers, we may

observe: 1. That they are the principal means of acquiring knowledge of the early history of Christianity after the apostolic age. It is not enough to know early Christianity merely from the New Testament. That, of course, is our sole authority for faith and practice; but the intelligent Christian will not want to isolate it from the Christian literature which followed it any more than from the secular environment amid which it arose. As he seeks light upon the New Testament itself from Oriental customs, from Jewish modes of thought, and from the political, social, and intellectual condition of the Roman Empire, so will he want to see how Christianity affected men's thought and conduct, how it was understood in the generations which succeeded the first, and how, as it mingled with the turbid stream of the world's life, it was itself modified by the influences which acted upon it. He knows that the theological statements and ecclesiastical forms with which he is acquainted are not, in most cases, put in precisely their present shape in the New Testament, though they may correctly convey the New Testament's teaching; and he will therefore wish to learn by what stages and under what circumstances the present forms were attained. The New Testament will be all the better appreciated by him when thus placed at the beginning of Christian history.

But it is one thing to read history, and another to study it. The latter alone gives real grasp upon the meaning of past events. One event or epoch thus grasped is worth to a man's culture a hundred about which he has merely read. To do this, however, the reader must go to the sources. He must examine the literature of the period in question. He must become well acquainted with the mental character of those who acted the chief parts in the drama. He must, so far as possible, come to know them at first hand, if he would vividly apprehend their significance and that of the events with which they were concerned.

Now, there is no easier way of doing this, for Christian history, than by the study of the Church Fathers. The perusal of their books is the quickest and best way of entering into the spirit of their times. Most of them were prominent actors in the history. Their writings disclose to us their minds and those of the Church and its opponents. We may obtain from them a distinct sense of both the good and evil which was current in the Church, of the changing phases of the long conflict between faith and unbelief, of the gradually clearer and deeper and broader

understanding of the gospel which, in spite of the rise of errors, kept pace, first in the Greek churches, and then in the Latin, with the territorial widening of Christendom. Especially in the literature of the first six centuries may this study be profitably pursued; while its biographical character will give natural centers about which to group in memory the relations of each successive epoch. Let any one thus firmly grasp the life and thought, the age and situation, of any of the principal Church Fathers, and he will have acquired a more useful lesson in the history of the Church than he could acquire by the perusal of many modern volumes.

2. Furthermore, the study of the Church Fathers will impress most readers with a fresh sense of the antiquity of the gospel.

The Bible is too often in our thought isolated from its historical connection with the life of the ancient world. Being regarded as a Divine authority, the circumstances of its composition are forgotten. Believed to be a gift of God to all mankind, the actual way in which it was given appears of slight importance, and passes from our thought. This is less the case now than formerly, but the remark is still true of many of its readers. Hence the fresh confidence which is felt when, for example, archæology unearths an ancient monument which attests the truthfulness of the scriptural narrative, or when the historian cites a secular witness to the existence and character of the early Christians.

Now much the same impression will be given to most readers of the Church Fathers. True, their works will often appear tedious and verbose. They frequently deal at great length with controversies of which not even the echoes now survive. But the reader will recognize in their pages the same religion which he himself professes. He will find them accepting the same facts of Christ's life which the Gospels record, commending usually the same cardinal duties and discussing the same fundamental doctrines. He may often think their arguments more ingenious than convincing, and may detect dangerous elements in their teaching; but as he meets these living monuments of ancient Christianity, and observes their unquestionable testimony to the historicity of the Gospel, he will usually obtain renewed confidence in it for himself. He will see against what a mighty stream of testimony unbelief has to contend, and will be convinced anew that the origin of Christianity is correctly described in the New Testament.

Bishop Lightfoot, if I remember correctly, has remarked, in one of his celebrated essays in answer to the book called "Supernatural Religion," that, if the modern inquirer would carefully read the work of Irenæus against Heresies, he would be better armed against the attacks of sceptical criticism than he would be by the study of all the German literature which has been issued upon the subject. Even Daillé, though living in the thick of the conflict with Romanism, and though his book was written to disprove the use then made of the Fathers, could not conclude without acknowledging this effect of their works when properly employed. "In this particular," he says, "their authority may be of good use to you, and may serve as a probable argument of the truth. For is it not a wonderful thing to see that so many great wits, born in so many several ages, during the space of fifteen hundred years, and in so many several countries, being also of such different tempers, and who in other things were of such contrary opinions, should, notwithstanding, be found all of them to agree so constantly and unanimously in the fundamentals of Christianity; that, amidst such great diversity of worship, they should all adore one and the same Christ; preach one and the same sanctification; hope, all of them, for one and the same immortality; acknowledge, all of them, the same Gospels; find therein, all of them, great and high mysteries?"

3. Still again, the perusal of the Fathers will have often the practical value of showing the antiquity of so-called "modern" unbelief. The reader will find that Christianity has had to contend with substantially the same foes all along her history. Sometimes even in form will the unbelief of antiquity be found identical with that met now. In other cases, old foes will be recognized under new faces. The thoughtful reader will detect, under the terms of ancient controversies, the same principles which are involved in those of recent date. He cannot, for example, examine Origen's work against Celsus without being surprised, on the one hand, at the intelligence and vigor with which, in the latter half of the second century, philosophy attacked the new religion which had at last forced itself on the unwilling notice of pagan culture, and, on the other hand, at the intelligence and vigor with which Christianity was defended. He will feel that the intellectual triumph of the new religion was as notable as at a later period was its civil and social victory.

Even in the absurd conceits of the Gnostics, against which some of the Fathers ar-

gue at great length, he will recognize the familiar battle between a transcendental philosophy and sober faith in historical Christianity; while only those who condemn all theology will fail to admire the books in which the Fathers contended, with much subtlety, no doubt, and often with unhappy rancor, but also with keen ability and thorough acquaintance with Scripture, against the effort of heresy to corrupt the faith once delivered to the saints. Gibbon relates, with a scarcely concealed sneer, the violent debates of the Nicene writers about an "iota,"—whether, that is, the Son is "homœousios" or "homoiousios" to the Father; but the smile vanishes from our lips when we remember the real significance of that iota, and when we recall more recent attacks upon the deity of Christ. It will, in fact, be of no little value, if, by reading the Fathers, some of the glamour which has been attached to the word "modern" be rubbed off, and if we realize the antiquity of unbelief in nearly all its present forms, as well as the antiquity of the truth.

4. To these considerations I may add the final remark that the study of the Fathers will give the reader a clearer idea of the variety of the types of mind to which Christianity has from the beginning appealed, and which it has enlisted in its service. As we pass in review the practical exhortations of Clement of Rome, the overheated enthusiasm of Ignatius, the rugged honesty and boldness of Justin's apology, the elaborate treatise of Irenæus, the fierce invective of Tertullian, the philosophical acumen of Clement of Alexandria and of Origen, the ecclesiastical generalship of Cyprian, the indignant pleas of Athanasius, the profound theology and the humble piety of Augustine, the scholarship of Jerome, and the eloquence of Chrysostom, we must perceive how wide was the area of thought and life covered by their religion. There is shown to have been, in the best sense, a catholic faith, for it absorbed into its service the whole energy of the human mind. Viewed in this way, the Church Fathers present to the reader shining illustrations of the broad scope and universal adaptation to humanity of the Christian faith.

These observations are, of course, intended for the general reader. To advanced students the value of the Fathers for the history of the canon of Scripture, for the text of the New Testament, and for the history of doctrine, is still greater. But they are worthy also of the acquaintance of every intelligent Christian. They should be read in critically edited, carefully made

translations. Many of them need be merely tasted. Others should be thoroughly studied. They should be neither indiscriminately admired nor neglected. But they have an important place in all broad and thorough Christian culture, and the indications which we have noticed of a revived interest in their writings seems to promise a better appreciation, by the public, of men whose fate it has so often been to be either unhappily canonized or ignorantly condemned.

THE BERNARDINES.

HOW THEY LIVE—IN SILENCE AND AUSTERITY, BUT HAPPY WITHAL.

From *The Catholic News*, New York, Jan. 12, 1890.

"EVERY day, as noon strikes from the clock-tower of the little church of Notre Dame de Refuge at Anglet, a sand-bound village near Bayonne, France, there files forth from the porch a notable procession. It is readily perceived that it is composed of women; but whatever may be beautiful or graceful in this womankind is carefully hidden. Each figure is clothed in a coarse white flannel skirt with a cape, carrying at the back a large black cross. Head and face," writes Mr. Henry W. Lucy in the *English Illustrated Magazine*, "are completely enveloped in a hood of the same rough material that composes the dress. The hood pokes out in front funnel-like, so that, unless one meets the wearer directly in front, there is no opportunity of looking on her face, nor may she regard the face of her kind. Chanting in low, monotonous notes, the melancholy procession, looking neither to the right nor to the left, with heads bowed and hands crossed, shuffle along in their 'sabots,' till they reach the door of the refectory. When the last has passed in, the door closes upon them, shutting out even the temporary darkened glance of the living world they had just enjoyed. These are the nuns known as the Bernardines, a religious sisterhood founded nearly sixty years ago by l'Abbé Cestac. The peculiarity of their vow is that they voluntarily resign the privilege of speech. Except when they join in a chant or murmur their prayers, they never open their lips to speak, and through the long year they hold no converse with human being. At the beginning, the founder of this strange Order proposed to the nuns that at least once a week they should accept relief from their vow, and celebrate Sunday by indulging in conversation.

But, enamoured of their new luxury, they declined the suggested amelioration of their lot, and remained silent all through the year.

"The foundations of the buildings connected with the Order were literally built upon the sand. Between the village of Anglet and the sea there lie plains of sand, with here and there a pine-tree braving the blasts from the Bay of Biscay. Half a century ago there dwelt here, housed in a straw hut, an old man who earned a pitiful living by growing a few vegetables. There was no one to dispute his territory, and little by little he scraped together a few perches of garden ground. L'Abbé Cestac found him here one day dying in the solitude of his hut. He removed him to a place of shelter, and in order to satisfy the yearnings of the dying man, he undertook to look after his carrots and turnips. L'Abbé had already started a refuge for fallen women, and it occurred to him to engage them upon the old man's pinched garden ground. Accordingly half-a-dozen women were despatched to the sand dunes, and there in solitude, with the sea on one hand and the distant village on the other, they began the work which to day has reclaimed many acres of valuable land. Where the monotonous sand heaps stood there now lies outstretched a smiling garden.

"But whilst 'les Solitaires,' as the Bernardines are called, form the most striking feature of this little colony, they are not the sole or numerically the largest section. There is a sister Order known as the 'Servantes de Marie.' These have all passed a life of purity before entering upon their novitiate. They share in the labors of the repentant women, but these can never become 'Servantes de Marie.' Between them the two classes till the soil and tend the garden. In addition there is a farm-yard and a dairy, where, as throughout the colony, all the work is done by women, with the occasional help of male laborers to grapple with the heaviest work. Everything, whether to eat or to wear, is grown or made within the borders of the colony. They are joiners, carpenters, shoemakers, bakers, and dress-makers—all women. The 'Servantes de Marie' do not confine their labors within the convent. They are ever ready to answer calls from the neighboring country, to nurse the sick, instruct the young, care for the aged, watch by the dying, and bury the dead. The largest building on the estate is the 'Pensionnat,' a vast boarding school, where over a hundred children are educated and maintained. The 'Servantes de Marie,' who have the institution in charge, provide

from their own ranks professors of English, German, Spanish, and music. There is a kind of lower school, where the children of the poorer classes are educated in a manner suitable to their necessities.

"At present there are over a thousand 'Servantes de Marie,' with something like a hundred novices, the Bernardines numbering only half a hundred. The colony at Anglet is the mother of many similar institutions. The sister who showed us round—a lady whose spirit forty-six years of immuring in a convent had not subdued, and who was about as lively a little body as I met in the south of France—told me that there are over one hundred and fifty houses scattered about France—at Bayonne, Bordeaux, La Rochelle, Toulouse, Montpellier, Limoges, Arras, Cambrai, and other places. These houses comprise orphanages, hospitals, and schools. Over eight thousand children owe their instruction to the 'Servantes de Marie.' In especial manner the Sisters' mission is to women. They seek out and succor young women who are being led astray, endeavoring to place them in the way of gaining an honest living. They shelter abandoned children, and take care of the babes of poor people whilst they are out earning their daily bread. As far as I could gather, the institution is self-sustaining, having no money endowment. Everybody works, and the proceeds of the common labor furnish them with nourishment. The principal source of money income is the sale of flowers. Camellias, in particular, thrive marvellously in these reclaimed sand-hills, and bring in a substantial revenue. The dairy is another profitable workshop, the Sisters being pardonably proud of their butter.

"Summer and winter Sisters and Bernardines rise at half-past four in the morning and go to bed at nine. Within the grounds is preserved one of the cells in which the pioneer Bernardines braved the heat and the cold of the lonely sand-hills. It is nearly built of straw, with pure, white sand for flooring. A narrow bed and a tiny table, carrying an infinitesimal ewer and washhand basin, comprise the furniture of the hut. The chapel in which the Sisters met for Mass was constructed in the same neat way, with walls of straw, roof of rough red tiles, and the soft sand in which the 'sabots' sank as the nuns walked to their appointed places. Now each nun has her stone-built cell, which may or may not be more comfortable, but certainly is not so picturesque as the earlier device.

"Though engaged in common work, the Bernardines live a class apart. They have

their own chapel, their own range of cells, and their own refectory. Entering the portion of the ground where their domicile is situated, the visitor is faced by the injunction: 'Priere de parler voix a basse.' This injunction extends to the 'Servantes de Marie,' who drop their voices to a whisper as they watch the ghostly line file past chanting something that might well be a dirge for the loveliness of life voluntarily abandoned for this grim solitude of death. 'They don't look very happy,' I ventured to observe to the buxom, bustling Sister who did the honors of the place. 'Mais, Monsieur!' she cried, with a look of genuine surprise, 'they are of a gayety incroyable.'

"Within the refectory the silence is from time to time broken by the voice of one of the Sisters, who reads passages from works enjoining humility and self-renunciation. Again a bell rings, and the hand uplifted to carry the meagre soup to the lips is arrested, the heads are bowed, and thoughts are concentrated on that heavenly home whither this thorny pathway, they are taught, infallibly leads. After a duly ordered interval, the scanty meal continued with more pious reflections from the reader, and another sudden interposition from the bell, with peremptory call to turn aside from the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, the lusts of the flesh, and the wiles of the devil, and think only of the world to come. Then silence reigns again over this

Party in the parlor,
All silent and all—

blessed.

THE HOWARD CENTENARY.

BY REV. R. SHINDLER.

From *The New York Observer* (Presbyterian), New York, Jan. 9, 1890.

JOHN HOWARD, the philanthropist, departed this life, January 20, 1790. What changes have taken place in the interval! The London of to-day and the America of to-day are very different from the London and the America of his day. From the last decade of the eighteenth century to the last decade of the nineteenth the world has made some progress and the Church some advances. When Howard died none of the modern missionary, or Bible, or Sunday-school societies had come into being, and now the seed of the kingdom is being sown everywhere. Meanwhile, the good seed of former sowings has sprung up and grown

marvellously ; though alas ! as has been too commonly the case from the beginning, the enemy has sown tares among the wheat, some of which are only too manifestly present now. We are speaking, not of the world in distinction from the visible Church, but of the visible Church itself. But Christ can, and will, hold his own, and the truth must prevail.

The father of the philanthropist conducted an upholsterer's business in Long Lane, Aldersgate Street, London, then, according to Stowe, "a place of note for the sale of apparel, linen, and upholsterers' goods, both second-hand and new, but chiefly for old." Before his distinguished son was born, he had secured an ample fortune, with which he retired, living first at Enfield, near London, and then in the village of Clapton, which is now within the Metropolitan area. In this latter place, it is supposed John was born, about the year 1720. He had first-rate tutors, but he did not make a scholar. Imagine the future philanthropist as a boy of thirteen. The minister of the old Independent chapel, in Stoke Newington, where the Howards attended, Rev. Mecaiah Townsend, is possibly expected to dine with the Howards to-day, and young John is dressed for the occasion. There he is in the garden, thin and spare and small for his age, with rather fragile frame. Looking into his face, we see a rather large nose, eyes sparkling and full of benevolence, and compressed lips, giving an unmistakable evidence of a strong will. The hair is cut short in front, but curled behind, and he is attired somewhat in the garb of a miniature courtier.

Schooling over, he begins an apprenticeship to Messrs. Newnam & Shipley, wholesale grocers, Warbling Street, where in olden time the Roman patricians had their villas on the banks of the Thames. He had no fondness for the grocers' warehouse, however, and no delight in ledgers and columns of figures. So, at his father's death, he purchases the cancelling of his indentures, and retires to apartments in Stoke Newington. His health was not good, but the tender nursing of Mrs. Towne, a widow, in whose house he lodged, was helpful to its restoration. His gratitude took the form of a proposal to marry her, though she was twice his age. She at first refused, but his importunity succeeded, as importunity commonly does. He was left a widower in 1755, after less than three years of happy married life, when he removed to lodgings in St. Paul's Churchyard. Two things happened here. First, his acquaintance with

Dr. Samuel Stennett, minister of Little Wild Street Baptist Chapel, and author of "On Jordan's stormy banks I stand," and other hymns. Little Wild Street Chapel is now the centre of Mr. George Hatton's Christian Mission, but then a rather aristocratic congregation gathered there, and Dr. Stennett was a favorite with old George III. Mr. Howard valued his ministry, and said in a letter to the Doctor that no man ever entered more into his religious sentiments, or more happily expressed them. "I bless God for your ministry. I pray God reward you a thousand-fold." The other incident was his first visit to the Continent, when he was taken prisoner by the French, and detained in prison some months. This was a painful but a wisely ordered event. It led to what became the great work of his life. What he saw and felt entered like iron into his soul. His character inspired the authorities with such confidence, however, that he was liberated on his parole, and actually returned to England to negotiate his freedom, having given his word that if he did not succeed, he would return to the prison. All through life he was a man of strict integrity. "My word is my bond" was the principle shaping all his dealings with high and low.

Howard's prison visitation, like true charity, began at home, but it did not stop at home. The prisons of London at that time—and we cannot in this short sketch go into the provinces, much less into continental countries—were dens of infamy, of misery, of vice, and of all abominations. Corruption, oppression, cruelty, and even worse evils, were rife everywhere. Howard did not take a bird's-eye view of these things, nor rely on the testimony of officials, nor on the statements of reports, if there were any ; he saw for himself. He dived into the depths of the dungeons ; he stood face to face with the misery ; he stripped bare the abuses and corruption, and brought all the abominations into the light of heaven and public opinion. He rested not until abuses gave place to reformation, and mercy mingled her balm with the woes of the suffering. Moreover, while exposing vice, injustice, and wrong, he sought to uplift the degraded, to brighten the darkness of the dungeon, and to make proper distinctions between the confirmed and hopeless criminal, and such as had taken only a few steps in the downward course.

The admiration in which he was held by very many for his self-denial and philanthropy may be seen in a story told by Dr. Stoughton. His London abode was for some years in Great Ormond Street, in the

neighborhood of many distinguished characters. A female had made several unsuccessful attempts to gain access to the great man, but at length she succeeded. Her appearance gave him the idea that he had before him a man in woman's clothes; so he rang the bell that a servant might be with him. These precautions were needless, for he had to do with a real woman, who gazed upon him with admiring wonder, poured out a flood of compliments and then retired, declaring that now she had seen the man who of all others was the object of her admiration, she should die in peace. Mr. Howard had ten years of happy married life with his second wife, his beloved Henrietta, and he was again a widower. During some of this time he resided at Cardington, near Bedford, and either rode or walked on Sabbath days to the Bunyan meeting, Bedford, until he helped to found a new interest in another part of the town. There is a monument to his memory in the parish church of Cardington, and Bedford is about to do honor to his memory by some centenary erection; but his real monument is in no one place, city, or country, but in all the cities and countries of Europe especially. Mr. Howard was one who feared the Lord from his youth, and all through his life he maintained a growing attachment to the faith of Christ, as it appears in the teaching of the Puritans, and shines in his own life and labors. Christ was his only hope, his sacrifice and redeeming blood, his trust, his confidence, his joy. When, therefore, having left home, at the age of nearly seventy, to make researches in the East concerning the plague and remedies for it, his glorious career was finally arrested at Cherson, Russia, he was neither alarmed nor unprepared. He knew whom he believed. Writing from the Hague, a few years before, he had said in his journal: "Shout, O my soul, 'grace, grace, free, sovereign, rich and unbounded grace!' Some hope have I—what joy is in that hope!—that nothing shall separate my soul from the love of God in Christ Jesus."

Called to prescribe for a young lady ill of a fever, he took the malady, and was borne to his grave shortly after his patient. In leaving England he had said: "The way to heaven from Grand Cairo is as near as from London."

His testimony to Admiral Priestman is well worthy to be repeated, but space is too narrow. It was without fear of death, and in full and joyous hope through Christ that he departed. He chose a spot for his grave in the village of Dauphiny. "There," said he, "lay me quietly in the earth, place a

sun-dial over my grave, and let me be forgotten." There sleeps his dust; but his name will never be forgotten, and in celebrating the centenary of his death we cannot do better than to glorify the grace of God in him, and then "go and do likewise."

A LETTER FROM PRESIDENT STORRS.

From *The Independent* (Congregational), New York, Jan. 9, 1890.

BROOKLYN, January 3, 1890.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE INDEPENDENT :

Different and perplexing statements having appeared concerning the action of the Prudential Committee of the American Board in the case of a recent application for missionary appointment, and concerning my own share in the matter, perhaps you will give me room for a statement which may help to make things plainer.

At the first meeting of the Committee to consider the case, held on Tuesday, December 3d, I was present; and having previously had a full conversation with the candidate, in company with Mr. Blatchford, I was prepared to vote for his appointment. I stated this to the Committee, and gave quite fully my reasons for it. No conclusion being reached at the time, another meeting was held on the following day, at which I was also present, again signifying my approval of the appointment.

On this day, Wednesday, I suggested, in the course of my remarks, such a form of minute as it had seemed to me possible that all members of the Committee might accept; presenting, in the first part, what appeared a fair summary of my letter of acceptance of two years ago, and closing with a vote of appointment. I did not move the adoption of this suggested minute, but read it, as I said at the time, as part of my remarks, in the hope that some one who had not previously favored the appointment might be willing to move its adoption. When the further consideration of the case was adjourned for two weeks, this written suggestion was left lying, with other memoranda, on the table. It had not been brought before the Committee by any motion.

At the adjourned meeting, on December 17th, it became apparent that the closing part of the minute, as suggested by me, appointing the candidate, would not command the necessary majority; but it was moved by another member that the first part of it

be adopted, a different conclusion being appended, viz. : to postpone further consideration of the case till the candidate should have finished his Seminary course. I could not regard this conclusion as wise. My mind had not changed as to the propriety of a present appointment. I anticipated the strong excitations of feeling, on either side, which have since appeared ; and perhaps I did not clearly see the pertinence of the first part of the minute, as I had drawn it, to the different conclusion now contemplated. But when it became evident that the proposal to postpone would be carried, I was naturally anxious that in the completed minute, which others were about to adopt, it should conspicuously appear—in precise correspondence with the facts—that the candidate was *not* rejected ; that his case was only postponed, was postponed to a definite time, and was postponed on a ground outside of thoughts already expressed by him on the subject of future probation ; on the ground, that is, that according to his own statement he had not yet studied eschatology, and therefore could have reached no mature conclusions upon it. The courtesy of those who approved the vote in which I could not personally join, allowed me to retouch the form of the minute, in the interest, as I thought, of clearness and of peace ; and though I did not afterward vote for it, I did, and do, “cordially unite” with those whose view was different from mine, in greatly preferring such a limited postponement, on a ground so special, to that indefinite postponement of the case which seemed at the time the only alternative. I thought, also, that all others whose views had substantially corresponded with mine on the general issue, were at one with me in this.

This is the brief history of my personal connection with the minute which was adopted, and which you have published. In one sense it is true, as has been stated, that I wrote it, in both its parts. In another, and a true sense, it was not mine ; the first part of it being applied to a different conclusion from what I had contemplated, the last part being shaped to express as carefully and distinctly as possible the decision of others, in which decision, except as an alternative to something more distinctly opposed to my views, I could not concur.

Enough has been said about this ; but now comes another question, of really large and grave importance—the question, that is, how it was possible for me, known wherever I am known at all as a steadfast conservative in theological thinking, to desire and

advocate the appointment as a missionary, under the Board, of one whose mind was certainly not clear on the ever-fresh subject of future probation ? I shall be glad to have space enough allowed, partially at least, to answer this question.

I am so conservative in theology as not to have as much patience as have some others, with whom in general I closely agree, with the theory, or hypothesis, of opportunity for repentance unto life eternal, beyond the grave. It has never seemed to me an error which reached to the centres of character, as does a defective doctrine of sin, or of regeneration. It has never seemed an error casting eclipse on the holy splendor of the character of God, as does that which denies retribution for sin, or which limits Divine grace to special church channels ; or as did the old doctrine that Christ died to satisfy and release the claim of the Devil on human sinners. Indeed, I have strongly sympathized with the moral motive behind the speculation, and have recognized it as finding original incentive in compassionate aspiration. But it has seemed to me an error, nevertheless, as it now does ; and one sure to involve much practical mischief. I have never hesitated to characterize it, when occasion demanded, as in my judgment without authority in the Scripture, unhistorical—unless the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory may be thought to have some affinity with it—as out of harmony with the *consensus* of existing evangelical thought, and as a too daring attempt to add to the Gospel something which the Master had not put therein. It has seemed to me especially unfriendly to faithful, fervent and patient missionary labor ; since it appears, at least, to justify the expectation that if men do *not* hear the Gospel in this life they will have a vastly extended space for repentance in the ages beyond, under the immediate exhibition of Christ, and in utter separateness from all present temptations of the world and of the flesh. I cannot reasonably presume that any man in whose mind an expectation like this is fixed will labor with earnestness, with heroic self-sacrifice, and with long endurance, to present the Lord imperfectly here to those who, if *not* thus partially and prematurely enlightened by human agency, will see Him personally, in Divine invitation and promise, amid the hereafter.

Of course this view seems narrow and harsh to those holding the opinion ; but my business is to speak with an unreserved frankness, and to show how the matter presents itself to me—presents itself now only more distinctly than it did when, sev-

eral years ago, the theory began to claim acceptance in Congregational pulpits and papers. If either of my honored associates in the Prudential Committee held this theory, as neither of them does, I could not vote to send him as a missionary, however much he might wish to go. The Board certainly was not established, and it does not exist, for the propagation of any such notion. The churches at large, contributing to the Board, do not accept it. I doubt if a dozen of the corporate members intelligently adopt it. I do not believe that any missionary society will ever be organized, or certainly will be long and effectively maintained, in which this speculation becomes a controlling practical force. I most heartily wish that every one applying for appointment to the Committee, of which I find myself unexpectedly a member, felt about the venturesome and unauthorized hypothesis precisely as I do.

But while I was sitting on the platform at Springfield two years ago, listening to the debate in which I purposely took no part, the faces of seminary students were before me, the expression of which enlightened me on some things. They were, to all appearance, precisely such students as we most need, for hard but fruitful missionary work; young, strong, earnest of spirit, and highly intelligent, but with a present expression of hesitation, doubt, almost painful perplexity, overlaying their primary expression of candor, moral enthusiasm, and loyalty to Christ. The question fronted me on the spot; it faced me afterward in every hour of the weeks which intervened between that meeting and my acceptance of the Presidency; it has never since ceased to occupy my thoughts: What should be, what must be, the attitude of the Board and of its Committee toward such young men? coming from our own households and churches, from our particular colleges and seminaries; not holding the doctrine of a future probation with any assured and final conviction, but doubting about it, feeling that perhaps it *may* be true, and with the impulsive temperament of youth, which does not look before and after, hoping that it *is* true. How should I, as President, how should all in office under the Board conscientiously bear themselves toward such young men? with whom our work may be rapidly expanded; without whom our largest plans are throttled. My first answer was given in my letter of acceptance; my last answer was given in the committee-room at Boston; and the two are identical. It is not an answer inspired or modified by considerations of what is ex-

pedient. It seems to me the only fair answer which can be given.

It is not the fault of these young men that their minds are not clear on a subject so recently emerging for discussion, and concerning which a leading professor in a leading Presbyterian seminary, speaking for his own communion, has just said that "there is great perplexity in the minds of the theologians and the ministry, as well as of the people." The responsibility is with the teachers, to whom the students are attached, in whom they confide, whose skill in teaching they daily feel, but who either fail to give clear instruction on the mysterious state to come, or give such instruction as sustains and encourages the new speculation. The impressions left on the student-mind are essentially secondary, not primary. They are lunar, not solar; the pallid reflection of what others have taught, of what has met them in lectures and reviews, not affirmative convictions, vivid and regnant in their own minds. I speak in the general, quite understanding that there have been and are distinct exceptions to the rule. Ordinarily, the immediate impressions are superficial, not likely to continue in many minds after larger experience, wider study, profounder reflection, and practical work. Certainly I have dropped many impressions left on my own mind by the excellent Dr. Woods, or by even the alert and animating Professor Stuart. Some of them are now so distant and indistinct that I hardly recall them. It is fairly to be expected that these young men, with independent inquiry, with prayer for God's guidance, and under the discipline of strenuous service, will by no means retain the comparatively confused and emotional impressions which now they may express, but will establish and co-ordinate, in harmony with the Scriptures, and under their light, their own schemes of spiritual thought.

How, then, are they to be treated now, when seeking to be sent on missionary service?

As I have said, if any decisively and deliberately maintain that beyond the grave wait ages of grace for those who have not here heard of Christ, then, so far as I am concerned, they will tarry at home, to do what good they may find to do here. I shall wish them well, and be glad to learn that the Lord has blessed them; but I would not commission one in whom I should see a possible affinity to the most intrepid and brilliant of the missionaries who have made heathendom radiant with their presence, if he thought, as in my judgment he ought consistently to think, that the heathen,

provided he does *not* go to them, will in the future have vast opportunities for repentance unto life, which may be sacrificed by now listening to him. I would sooner set a man to run a race with a ten-pound shot tied to each ankle, than send a man with this fixed expectation to preach to Hottentot or Hawaiian.

But how shall those be treated who simply doubt, and do not profess to know or affirm? whose minds in a measure reflect the teachings which they have heard, but whose impressions are still "tentative and unfixed"?

Plainly, imperatively, according to my conception of things, they are not to be met by any abrupt and sharp-edged challenge, to the effect that "if you doubt you cannot go." I do not suppose that they ever have been thus met; certainly they must not be, so long as I have a voice in the matter. They must not be taken, either, in groups, or in any way classified, as coming from this seminary, or that, or the other. Each case must be considered by itself, patiently, candidly, with a sincerely sympathetic endeavor to ascertain exactly the reach and the force of the admitted doubt; an effort made largely in face to face conference, in addition, at least, to those interchanged writings which may be needed, but in which, especially on the part of the young, the expression of thought is apt to be less free and familiar, more conventional and more theoretic. In such conversation great pains should be taken to disengage feeling from conviction, a sympathetic desire from a dogmatic bias, the effect of a diffused epidemical sentiment from a personal tendency; and the line should be sharply drawn between a thought lying loosely in the mind, and a theory which is entertained as a necessary part of a speculative scheme; between a state of mind still in flux on the subject, and one consciously set toward predetermined conclusions. Above all, it should be found whether one is heartily ready to leave the whole matter in the hands of God, as one on which He has not spoken; or is practically convinced that He *must* do in one way, and not otherwise, to vindicate His justice. I said two years ago that the shadings of thought, at this point, would probably be delicate and intricate in some minds. I have never seen reason to modify the forecast. But the essential moral element in the mind of a candidate can be reached; and it must be somebody's business to do it. To get now and then a good missionary, whom we otherwise should have missed, is worth many times more than all the trouble. It cannot be

done, in my judgment, by the mere presentation of creed-forms, useful as these are in many ways, and highly as I honor them. The subtler states and processes of thought in an eager, sensitive, and troubled young mind, can no more be accurately measured by such than a perfume in the air can be measured by yard-sticks.

Suppose it then to be ascertained, through frank conference, that the candidate does not positively hold the theory of opportunity for repentance beyond the grave, either as part of a speculative scheme, or as clearly sustained by the Scriptures, but is yet in a certain perplexity about it, sometimes more distinctly inclining to it, and again feeling that it has no sufficient support; what comes next? I should say, without doubt, to certify ourselves of his clear and firm hold on the inspiration and authority of the Scripture, on the true nature and work of Christ, on the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and on the present responsibility and condemnation of the heathen, as set forth with just and appalling emphasis in the New Testament; and then to minister to any remaining and unreduced doubt concerning a future gracious opportunity, not principally by philosophical argument—to address which to states of tangled thought, into which feeling intimately enters, is generally like trying to heal a sore with a handspike—not even so much by selected texts of the Scripture, but by stirring afresh his missionary enthusiasm, by setting him to absorb the whole substance of the Gospel without pinning his attention to the austere problems of the future, and, as soon as possible, by putting him to work in some appropriate missionary field.

It has been, and is, my fixed conviction that, as I said two years ago, "evangelists and missionaries naturally draw nearest to the heart of the Gospel." It is only an ever-fresh illustration of the words of the Master, that if any man be steadfastly minded to do with his might the will of the Father, he shall know of the doctrine. These recent, remote, and, as I think, misleading and vain speculations, are bred in the air of metaphysical meditation, in minds which are restless until they shall have planned the Divine scheme into conformity with their ethical suggestions. Energetic personal work for Christ puts the mind in a different spiritual atmosphere; and work among the heathen, with no fettering moral commitment to the lecture-room theory, will usually clarify, instruct and energize, more than any number of lectures could.

A candid and devoted young man so work-

ing, for the glory of Christ and for man's highest welfare, will almost certainly come to see that the unevangelized peoples are not unfortunate, merely, through deficiency of light, but are consciously guilty, sinning against the light which they have, and having more light from Christ himself, by his Spirit, than had been imagined; that they love and cleave to their evil lusts, against whatever remonstrance of reason, of the natural conscience, of the teachings of experience, of the teachings of the wise, against the admonitions of Providence, and against the rebuke of the still small voice. He will almost certainly ere long encounter the question, from some acute sinner on whom he is vainly expending his force, "If you are convinced that chances for repentance are reserved for my people, in unlimited futures beyond the grave, why not leave us to enjoy the pleasant sins in which we delight, and of which we shall have opportunity to repent when temptations are removed, and when He of whom you speak appears, in the large by-and-by?"

A man uncommitted to any theory, and working with the full swing of his strength in the missionary field, will understand practically, and not as a mere linguistic expert, the view which Paul had of the voluntary perverse wickedness of the world, as set forth in his tremendous indictment in the letter to the Romans; and he will enter, I should hope, into closer sympathy with that magnificent missionary leader, who certainly wrote and wrought and suffered with no thought whatever of any probation beyond the grave. Most of all, I should hope, he will come to a more intimate fellowship with the mind of the Master; understanding the secret of his immense urgency to have the Gospel preached *at once*, in all the world, while freshly alive to his supreme declaration that many who have not consciously seen him will come, or will not come, into his kingdom, according as they have done, or have not done, among the needy and the sick, the works of his spirit. I should expect such a man to feel it ere long an almost blasphemous thing for himself, as a weak servant of Christ, to add an uncertain human speculation to His sublime and tender Gospel; and I should certainly know that he would find such a theory in his own hands, what I called it long ago, "a tin blade," poorly replacing the sword of the Spirit.

This, then, is the plan of administration concerning missionary candidates which I outlined at the start, and to which I still energetically adhere: No appointment of

one distinctly and affirmatively committed to the theory of a future probation; a candid, tender and sympathetic judgment of each case of perplexed and doubtful opinion; taking it by itself, and making no one a precedent for another; when assured of a firm and intelligent hold on the essentials of evangelical faith in one thus doubting, a large reliance on missionary zeal, and on the educating force of missionary work, to bring the clearness and unity of right convictions to replace the state of intermingled and uncompleted thought and feeling presently presented. And I hope that nobody will be offended if I frankly add that about the last thing which I should do for a young man of ardent and receptive mind, in this dubious state, of whom I wanted to make a missionary, would be to discourage his missionary impulse, and send him back to Andover, with a more or less keen sense of repulse, to get further light on eschatology. I say this without prejudice, as without any favoring prepossession. I have seen Andover but once in more than thirty years, and then on an errand to the Abbott Academy. I shall very likely never see the place again. But with all respect for the accomplished and industrious teachers who occupy its chairs, I would far sooner send one to Zululand or Japan, on a mission for Christ, than send him to them, as an inquiring student, to get correct views of what some of them regard as "the larger hope." In moral therapeutics, and for purposes of cure, I doubt the maxim "*similia similibus*."

All this which I have rapidly written was contained implicitly, and most of it was articulated with perfect distinctness, in my letter accepting the Presidency. It was not, as I said, any fabricated scheme to meet an emergency. It seemed to me the dictate of a sound common sense, and of a temperate Christian wisdom. It was approved, at the time, by those in whose judgment I have more confidence than I have in my own. It appeared, in a measure, to relieve a tension which was fast becoming insupportable. It was adopted, without manifested dissent, by "both wings," at the recent meeting in New York. It is to-day, in my judgment, the fair, reasonable, almost the only basis, on which we can treat young men from our schools without injustice; and the only basis of harmonious co-operation among those heretofore combined in the Board. It repeats the admonition to exercise "caution," and to give no approval to a doctrine which the Board has disallowed. But it frankly and fairly meets the feeling—which is a just feeling—of those

who insist that young men of fine parts, of fine promise, of a fervent consecration and an earnest missionary temper, are not to be peremptorily repelled by the Board, because, without having reached a conclusion which it disapproves, their minds, under the influences around them, are in a transition state of doubt. Whether anybody else accepts it or not, I stand by this, as a fair and permanent method of action; and I applied it, and wished if possible to have others apply it, in the case lately before the Committee.

I had had no personal knowledge of the young man then appearing, until I met him, by my request, for a two hours' talk. He had written some things, as I partly knew and was afterward more fully advised, which I regretted, and which embarrassed his case before the Committee. But he left the distinct impression upon me of a sincere, manly, Christian student, who had come out of early and extreme unbelief into a clear apprehension of Christ, and a glad consecration to his service; who had no assured conviction on the subject of probation after death; who thought it a "perhaps," at least for some; probably, but not certainly, indicated by the famous passages in Peter; possibly, but not certainly, involved in the universality of the atonement; and who was as earnest to preach the Gospel as if he positively *knew* that after death was no chance of repentance. He seemed to me likely to make a good missionary—diligent, faithful, with a spirit receptive of what God should teach; and while I was sorry that his mind was not wholly in tune with mine, I should have been glad to leave that mind just where it was, with no fresh bias against my convictions, until missionary service had had its effect on him. Others thought differently, being as clear and conscientious as I was, in their adverse judgment; and under the circumstances I tried, as I have said, to secure the most inoffensive form in which to record the action thus adopted. I sincerely hope that the Andover professors may help him toward that light which he needs, as much as I should confidently expect that the idolaters of Asia would.

The length of this letter is becoming intolerable; yet please allow me a word or two more.

Attacks upon myself are of no account. I have met too many to now think of them twice; and the general verdict has not been discouraging. But I earnestly deprecate violent attacks on the Prudential Committee, or on either of the Secretaries. In this whole business there has been too much of

confusing animosity. The members of the Committee are conscious of an important trust, and are keenly sensible of obligation to the Board. They are sincere and faithful men, differing in opinion, but all trying to do their duty fairly and kindly. Abuse is rarely an instrument of persuasion. It is only semi-barbarous men and women who try to work conviction in each other with broomsticks and bludgeons. In cases like those presented to the Committee, the "personal equation" is of necessity a significant factor in determining the judgment; and this is not likely to be favorably affected by acrid assault. It is no conventional form of words in which I say that I have the highest regard for all the members of the Committee, and for each of the Secretaries. The Home Secretary, whose name seems to many a modern synonym for perpendicular stiffness, has been a friend of mine since, as a boy older than himself, I fear that I sometimes tried his patience. I shall very likely differ from him again, and differ variously, in matters of detail; but I shall not fail affectionately to honor his soundness in doctrine, or his fidelity to his convictions. The dear and honored Vice-President of the Board is as near to my heart as if he were a brother by blood; and I cannot express the joy which I have felt in finding his experienced spirit, and his acute, practical mind, in close sympathy with mine, on whatever subjects have come before us. I am confident still, as I said at the Tabernacle, that those who have been divided heretofore, more by sympathy than by doctrine, are surely coming to work together, with mutual respect and with cordial consent; not seeking the reversing of any action of the Board, but recognizing the fact that intelligent caution is not at all indiscriminate prohibition, that acknowledged perplexity is not of necessity factious or virulent, and agreeing sometimes to appoint the honest inquiring doubter, without forcing him to statements which he cannot accept, and without, on the other hand, indorsing his doubt.

At any rate, I have no other wisdom to present on the subject than this, which was expressed two years ago, and is here expressed again. I have given to the office which I was most unwilling to take a large measure of the strength which is not altogether as elastic as it was, and in the aggregate many weeks out of the years which are passing like swift and vanishing clouds. I can fairly call all to witness that every suggestion in my letter of acceptance, looking toward harmony, has been on my part punctually fulfilled. A Committee has been ap-

pointed, and continued, to consider the relation of the Board to the churches. Another Committee has been appointed—composed, in a majority, of those critical of the methods pursued at the Rooms—to investigate those methods. I have done what I could, and shall do it hereafter, to carry out fully the terms and the spirit of my primary Letter, toward candidates for appointment. I am intent upon only one end: to have the Board maintain its faith, restore its unity, and send the Good Tidings, to proclaim which is its glory, with wider sweep than ever before throughout the world. The way to this seems to me as plain as the path across the Brooklyn Bridge. I do not expect to grow weary in well doing till the Master says, "Cease! Come, and give thy account!" If others go with me, I am perfectly assured that the end we desire is not far off; and in that end will be a reward for everything that any of us have done, for all our waiting, and all our work. But if any one has a better wisdom on this entangled and irritating matter, which has stirred so much controversy that it now seems difficult to touch it without passion, if he will take the place at the head of the Board which I shall only too gladly vacate, I will give every atom of personal influence to his support; and he will be hailed by no one else with so quick an enthusiasm as by

Yours faithfully,

R. S. STORRS.

PARAGRAPHIC.

PROFESSOR CHARLES AUGUST HASE, the well-known German theologian, died on the 3d of January, at Jena. Professor Hase was born in Steinbach, Saxony, in 1800. He became professor of theology at Jena in 1830. He is best known in this country from his "History of the Church."

A PRETTY little girl and a young gentleman met on the street, and the following conversation took place. She—"Why, Will, what are you doing down here? I thought you were in A." He—"Oh, I'm down here attending the college of pharmacy over here on Court Street." She—"And you are going to be a farmer? How nice that will be!" gleefully clapping her hands.—*The Southern Churchman, Richmond, Va., January 2d, 1890.*

At a recent introduction of a bishop to his see somebody noticed a Dublin graduate wearing an Oxford hood. He pointed it out to the bishop, and said that this person stood there with a lie on his back. "Well," replied his lordship, "you can hardly call it a lie, but it is certainly a falsehood."—*The Living Church, Chicago, January 18th, 1890.*

HIS PEDIGREE.—*Englishman* (to stranger): "Excuse me, sir, but aren't you a foreigner?" *Stranger*: "Foreigner? No, sir. I'm an American, pure and simple." *Englishman*: "Ah! and what tribe do you belong to, please?"—*The Christian Register, Boston, January 16th, 1890.*

LACORDAIRE wrote of his conversion: "Once a real Christian, the world did not vanish before my eyes. It rather assumed nobler proportions, as I did myself. Instead of a great, fleeting, empty theatre of ambition, I began to see therein the suffering needing help; and could imagine nothing comparable to the happiness of ministering to it with the help of the cross of the Gospel of Christ." The Christian should love the world much, not for itself, but because of the opportunity it presents of noblest service for the glory of God. For even God Himself "so loved the world."—*The Standard of the Cross, Philadelphia, Pa., December 28th, 1889.*

In a certain church in Ireland a young priest was detailed to preach. The occasion was his first appearance, and he took for his text, "The feeding of the multitude." He said: "They fed ten people with ten thousand loaves of bread and ten thousand fishes." An old Irishman said, "That's no miracle; begorra I could do that myself," which the priest overheard. The next Sunday the priest announced the same text, but he had it right this time. He said, "And they fed ten thousand people on ten loaves of bread and ten fishes." He waited a second or two, and then leaned over the pulpit, and said, "And could you do that, Mr. Murphy?" Mr. Murphy replied, "And sure, your reverence, I could." "And how could you do it, Mr. Murphy?" said the priest. "And sure, your reverence, I could feed them with what was over from last time."—*The Reformed Church Record, Reading January 9th, 1890.*

HERE is the way Bob Burdette puts it. Let the grumbling brother beware.

Home returneth the good pastor from an earned vacation in Europe, joyously greeting his native land. To him the elder, far better than the pastor, comes with fervent greeting for his welcome home. Shaking his head sadly, he says with earnestness that far outstrips his originality, "Ah, parson, the devil never takes a vacation."

"No indeed," the parson replied, with an outburst of genuine heartiness, "he doesn't need one; he never works hard enough. If he should take my contract to drag this congregation up hill to heaven, instead of merely amusing himself by dancing with it on the primrose grade, he'd want a vacation every six weeks, and then he'd break down before the year was out."—*The Central Baptist, St. Louis, December 26th, 1889.*

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.—If Congress can in any way bring about suitable legislation respecting marriage and divorce, that shall have a scope as wide as the entire nation, a great boon will be conferred upon the people. As matters now stand, with the laws on these subjects wholly in the hands of the individual States, not only are the statutes often contradictory, but it is rendered very easy for base persons to take advantage of such contradictions to foster and further evil designs. The number of decrees of divorce issued in the country each year is simply appalling. Every good Christian ought to do his best to bring forward the teaching of the New Testament as here affording the only true rule, and all ministers should be very cautious, lest they unwittingly increase the more or less prevailing spirit of indifference. All who have the good of this nation at heart should use what influence they have to mould public sentiment for the procuring of uniform and correct legislation on these matters, so important for the family life of the people.—*The Moravian, Bethlehem January 15th, 1890.*

AGNOSTICISM.

A REPLY TO PROFESSOR HUXLEY.

BY HENRY WACE, D.D.

(Continued from the January number, p. 249.)

WHAT is his answer to that simple and broad question? Strange to say, absolutely none at all! He leaves this vital question without any answer, and goes back to the Gadarene swine. The question he raises is whether the supposed incredibility of the story of the Gadarene swine involves the general untrustworthiness of the story of the Gospels; and his conclusion is that it involves the incredibility of the story of the Gadarene swine. A more complete evasion of his own question it would be difficult to imagine. As Professor Huxley almost challenges me to state what I think of that story, I have only to say that I fully believe it, and moreover that Professor Huxley, in this very article, has removed the only consideration which would have been a serious obstacle to my belief. If he were prepared to say, on his high scientific authority, that the narrative involves a contradiction of established scientific truth, I could not but defer to such a decision, and I might be driven to consider those possibilities of interpolation in the narrative, which Professor Huxley is good enough to suggest to all who feel the improbability of the story too much for them. But Professor Huxley expressly says:

I admit I have no *a priori* objection to offer. . . . For anything I can absolutely prove to the contrary, there may be spiritual things capable of the same transmigration, with like effects. . . . So I declare, as plainly as I can, that I am unable to show cause why these transferable devils should not exist.

Very well, then, as the highest science of the day is unable to show cause against the possibility of the narrative, and as I regard the Gospels as containing the evidence of trustworthy persons who were contemporary with the events narrated, and as their general veracity carries to my mind the greatest possible weight, I accept their statement in this as in other instances. Professor Huxley ventures "to doubt whether at this present moment any Protestant theologian, who has a reputation to lose, will say that he believes the Gadarene story." He will judge whether I fall under his description; but I repeat that I believe it, and that he has removed the only objection to my believing it.

However, to turn finally to the important fact of external evidence. Professor Hux-

ley reiterates, again and again, that the verdict of scientific criticism is decisive against the supposition that we possess in the four Gospels the authentic and contemporary evidence of known writers. He repeats, "without the slightest fear of refutation, that the four Gospels, as they have come to us, are the work of unknown writers." In particular, he challenges my allegation of "M. Renan's practical surrender of the adverse case;" and he adds the following observations, to which I beg the reader's particular attention:

I thought (he says) I knew M. Renan's works pretty well, but I have contrived to miss this "practical"—(I wish Dr. Wace had defined the scope of that useful adjective)—surrender. However, as Dr. Wace can find no difficulty in pointing out the passage of M. Renan's writings, by which he feels justified in making his statement, I shall wait for further enlightenment, contenting myself, for the present, with remarking that if M. Renan were to retract and do penance in Notre Dame to-morrow for any contributions to biblical criticism that may be specially his property, the main results of that criticism, as they are set forth in the works of Strauss, Baur, Reuss, and Volkmar, for example, would not be sensibly affected.

Let me begin then, by enlightening Professor Huxley about M. Renan's surrender. I have the less difficulty in doing so as the passages he has contrived to miss have been collected by me already in a little tract on the "Authenticity of the Gospels,"* and in some lectures on the "Gospel and its Witnesses;"† and I shall take the liberty, for convenience' sake, of repeating some of the observations there made.

I beg first to refer to the preface to M. Renan's "Vie de Jésus."‡ There M. Renan says:

As to Luke, doubt is scarcely possible. The Gospel of St. Luke is a regular composition, founded upon earlier documents. It is the work of an author who chooses, curtails, combines. The author of this Gospel is certainly the same as the author of the Acts of the Apostles. Now, the author of the Acts seems to be a companion of St. Paul—a character which accords completely with St. Luke. I know that more than one objection may be opposed to this reasoning; but one thing at all events is beyond doubt, namely, that the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts is a man who belonged to the second apostolic generation; and this suffices for our purpose. The date of this Gospel, moreover, may be determined with sufficient precision by considerations drawn from the book itself. The twenty-first chapter of St. Luke, which is inseparable from the rest of the work, was certainly written after the siege of Jerusalem, but not long after. We are, therefore, here on solid ground, for we are dealing with a work proceeding entirely from the same hand, and possessing the most complete unity.

* Religious Tract Society.
‡ Fifteenth edition, p. xlix.

† John Murray, 1883.

It may be important to observe that this admission has been supported by M. Renan's further investigations, as expressed in his subsequent volume on "The Apostles." In the preface to that volume he discusses fully the nature and value of the narrative contained in the Acts of the Apostles, and he pronounces the following decided opinions as to the authorship of that book, and its connection with the Gospel of St. Luke (page x. *sq.*) :

One point which is beyond question is that the Acts are by the same author as the third Gospel, and are a continuation of that Gospel. One need not stop to prove this proposition, which has never been seriously contested. The prefaces at the commencement of each work, the dedication of each to Theophilus, the perfect resemblance of style and of ideas, furnish on this point abundant demonstrations.

A second proposition, which has not the same certainty, but which may, however, be regarded as extremely probable, is that the author of the Acts is a disciple of Paul, who accompanied him for a considerable part of his travels.

At a first glance, M. Renan observes, this proposition appears indubitable, from the fact that the author, on so many occasions, uses the pronoun "we," indicating that on those occasions he was one of the apostolic band by whom St. Paul was accompanied. "One may even be astonished that a proposition apparently so evident should have found persons to contest it." He notices however, the difficulties which have been raised on the point, and then proceeds as follows (page 14) :

Must we be checked by these objections? I think not; and I persist in believing that the person who finally prepared the Acts is really the disciple of Paul, who says "we" in the last chapters. All difficulties, however insoluble they may appear, ought to be, if not dismissed, at least held in suspense, by an argument so decisive as that which results from the use of this word "we."

He then observes that mss. and tradition combine in assigning the third Gospel to a certain Luke, and that it is scarcely conceivable that a name in other respects obscure should have been attributed to so important a work for any other reason than that it was the name of the real author. Luke, he says, had no place in tradition, in legend, or in history, when these two treatises were ascribed to him. M. Renan concludes in the following words: "We think, therefore, that the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts is in all reality Luke, the disciple of Paul."

Now let the import of these expressions of opinion be duly weighed. Of course, M. Renan's judgments are not to be regarded as affording in themselves any adequate

basis for our acceptance of the authenticity of the chief books of the New Testament. The Acts of the Apostles and the four Gospels bear on their face certain positive claims, on the faith of which they have been accepted in all ages of the Church; and they do not rest, in the first instance, on the authority of any modern critic. But though M. Renan would be a very unsatisfactory witness to rely upon for the purpose of positive testimony to the Gospels, his estimates of the value of modern critical objections to those sacred books have all the weight of the admissions of a hostile witness. No one doubts his familiarity with the whole range of the criticism represented by such names as Strauss and Baur, and no one questions his disposition to give full weight to every objection which that criticism can urge. Even without assuming that he is prejudiced on either one side or the other, it will be admitted on all hands that he is more favorably disposed than otherwise to such criticism as Professor Huxley relies on. When, therefore, with this full knowledge of the literature of the subjects, such a writer comes to the conclusion that the criticism in question has entirely failed to make good its case on a point like that of the authorship of St. Luke's Gospel, we are at least justified in concluding that critical objections do not possess the weight which unbelievers or sceptics are wont to assign to them. M. Renan, in a word, is no adequate witness to the Gospels; but he is a very significant witness as to the value of modern critical objections to them.

Let us pass to the two other so-called "synoptical" Gospels. With respect to St. Matthew, M. Renan says in the same preface ("Vie de Jésus," p. lxxxi.) :

To sum up, I admit the four canonical Gospels as serious documents. All go back to the age which followed the death of Jesus; but their historical value is very diverse. St. Matthew evidently deserves peculiar confidence for the discourses. Here are "the oracles," the very notes taken while the memory of the instruction of Jesus was living and definite. A kind of flashing brightness at once sweet and terrible, a divine force, if I may so say, underlies these words, detaches them from the context, and renders them easily recognizable by the critic.

In respect again to St. Mark, he says (p. lxxxi.) :

The Gospel of St. Mark is the one of the three synoptics which has remained the most ancient, the most original, and to which the least of later additions have been made. The details of fact possess in St. Mark a definiteness which we seek in vain in the other evangelists. He is fond of reporting certain sayings of our Lord in Syro-Chaldaic. He is full of minute observations, proceeding, beyond doubt, from an eye-witness. There is nothing to

conflict with the supposition that this eye-witness, who had evidently followed Jesus, who had loved him and watched him in close intimacy, and who had preserved a vivid image of him, was the apostle Peter himself, as Papias has it.

I call these admissions a "practical surrender" of the adverse case, as stated by critics like Strauss and Baur, who denied that we had in the Gospels contemporary evidence, and I do not think it necessary to define the adjective, in order to please Professor Huxley's appetite for definitions. At the very least it is a direct contradiction of Professor Huxley's statement* that we know "absolutely nothing" of "the originator or originators" of the narratives in the first three Gospels; and it is an equally direct contradiction of the case, on which his main reply to my paper is based, that we have no trustworthy evidence of what our Lord taught and believed.

But Professor Huxley seems to have been apprehensive that M. Renan would fail him, for he proceeds, in the passage I have quoted, to throw him over and to take refuge behind "the main results of biblical criticism, as they are set forth in the works of Strauss, Baur, Reuss, and Volkmar, for example." It is scarcely comprehensible how a writer, who has acquaintance enough with this subject to venture on Professor Huxley's sweeping assertions, can have ventured to couple together those four names for such a purpose. "Strauss, Baur, Reuss, and Volkmar!" Why, they are absolutely destructive of one another! Baur rejected Strauss's theory and set up one of his own; while Reuss and Volkmar in their turn have each dealt fatal blows at Baur's. As to Strauss, I need not spend more time on him than to quote the sentence in which Baur himself puts him out of court on this particular controversy. He says,† "The chief peculiarity of Strauss's work is, that it is a criticism of the Gospel history without a criticism of the Gospels." Strauss, in fact, explained the miraculous stories in the Gospels by resolving them into myths, and it was of no importance to his theory how the documents originated. But Baur endeavored, by a minute criticism of the Gospels themselves, to investigate the historical circumstances of their origin; and he maintained that they were *Tendenz-Schriften*, compiled in the second century, with polemical purposes. Volkmar, however, is in direct conflict with Baur on this point, and in the very work to which Professor Huxley refers,‡ he enu-

merates (p. 18) among "the written testimonies of the first century"—besides St. Paul's epistles to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans, and the apocalypse of St. John—"the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, according to John Mark of Jerusalem, written a few years after the destruction of Jerusalem, between the years 70 and 80 of our reckoning—about 75 probably; to be precise, about 73," and he proceeds to give a detailed account of it, "according to the oldest text, and particularly the Vatican text," as indispensable to his account of Jesus of Nazareth. He treats it as written (p. 172) either by John Mark of Jerusalem himself, or by a younger friend of his. Baur, therefore, having upset Strauss, Volkmar proceeds to upset Baur; and what does Reuss do? I quote again from that splendid French edition of the Bible, on which Professor Huxley so much relies. On page 88 of Reuss's introduction to the synoptic Gospels, he sums up "the results he believes to have been obtained by critical analysis," under thirteen heads; and the following are some of them:

2. Of the three synoptic Gospels one only, that which ecclesiastical tradition agrees in attributing to Luke, has reached us in its primitive form.

3. Luke could draw his knowledge of the Gospel history partly from oral information; he was able, in Palestine itself, to receive direct communications from immediate witnesses. . . . We may think especially here of the history of the passion and the resurrection, and perhaps also of some other passages of which he is the sole narrator.

4. A book, which an ancient and respectable testimony attributes to Mark, the disciple of Peter, was certainly used by St. Luke as the principal source of the portion of his Gospel between chapter iv. 31, and ix. 50; and between xviii. 15, and xxi. 38.

5. According to all probability, the book of Mark, consulted by Luke, comprised in its primitive form what we read in the present day from Mark i. 21, to xiii. 37.

It seems unnecessary, for the purpose of estimating the value of Professor Huxley's appeal to these critics, to quote any more. It appears from these statements of Reuss that if "the results of biblical criticism," as represented by him, are to be trusted, we have the whole third Gospel in its primitive form, as it was written by St. Luke; and in this, as we have seen, Reuss is in entire agreement with Renan. But besides this, a previous book written by Mark, St. Peter's disciple, was certainly in existence before Luke's Gospel, and was used by Luke; and in all probability this book was, in its primitive form, the greater part of our present Gospel of St. Mark.

Such are those "results of biblical criti-

* Page 24.

† "Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien," 1847, p. 41.

‡ "Jesus Nazareus und die erste christliche Zeit," 1882.

cism" to which Professor Huxley has appealed; and we may fairly judge by these not only of the value of his special contention in reply to my paper, but of the worth of the sweeping assertions he, and writers like him, are given to making about modern critical science. Professor Huxley says that we know "absolutely nothing" about the originators of the Gospel narratives, and he appeals to criticism in the persons of Volkmar and Reuss. Volkmar says that the second Gospel is really either by St. Mark or by one of his friends, and was written about the year 75. Reuss says that the third Gospel, as we now have it, was really by St. Luke. Now Professor Huxley is, of course, entitled to his own opinion; but he is not entitled to quote authorities in support of his opinion when they are in direct opposition to it. He asserts, without the slightest fear of refutation, that "the four Gospels, as they have come to us, are the work of unknown writers." His arguments in defence of such a position will be listened to with great respect; but let it be borne in mind that the opposite arguments he has got to meet are not only those of orthodox critics like myself, but those of Renan, of Volkmar, and of Reuss—I may add of Pfleiderer, well known in this country by his Hibbert Lectures, who, in his recent work on original Christianity, attributes most positively the second Gospel in its present form to St. Mark, and declares that there is no ground whatever for that supposition of an *Ur-Marcus*—that is, an original groundwork—from which Professor Huxley alleges that "at the present time there is no visible escape." If I were such an authority on morality as Professor Huxley, I might perhaps use some unpleasant language respecting this vague assumption of criticism being all on his side, when it, in fact, directly contradicts him; and his case is not the only one to which such strictures might be applied. In "Robert Elsmere," for example, there is some vamping about the "great critical operation of the present century" having destroyed the historical basis of the Gospel narrative. As a matter of fact, as we have seen, the great critical operation has resulted, according to the testimony of the critics whom Professor Huxley himself selects, in establishing the fact that we possess contemporary records of our Lord's life from persons who were either eye-witnesses, or who were in direct communication with eye-witnesses, on the very scene in which it was passed. Either Professor Huxley's own witnesses are not to be trusted, or Professor Huxley's allegations are rash and unfounded. Conclusions which

are denied by Volkmar, denied by Renan, denied by Reuss, are not to be thrown at our heads with a superior air, as if they could not be reasonably doubted. The great result of the critical operation of this century has, in fact, been to prove that the contention with which it started in the persons of Strauss and Baur, that we have no contemporary records of Christ's life, is wholly untenable. It has not convinced any of the living critics to whom Professor Huxley appeals; and if he, or any similar writer, still maintains such an assertion let it be understood that he stands alone against the leading critics of Europe in the present day.

Perhaps I need say no more for the present in reply to Professor Huxley. I have, I think, shown that he has evaded my point; he has evaded his own points; he has misquoted my words; he has misrepresented the results of the very criticism to which he appeals; and he rests his case on assumptions which his own authorities repudiate. The questions he touches are very grave ones, not to be adequately treated in a review article. But I should have supposed it is a point of scientific morality to treat them, if they are to be treated, with accuracy of reference and strictness of argument.

IV.

AGNOSTICISM.

A REPLY TO PROFESSOR HUXLEY.

BY W. C. MAGEE, BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

I SHOULD be wanting in the respect which I sincerely entertain for Professor Huxley if I were not to answer his "appeal" to me in the last number of this review for my opinion on a point in controversy between him and Dr. Wace. Professor Huxley asks me, "in the name of all that is Hibernian, why a man should be expected to call himself a miscreant or an infidel?" I might reply to this after the alleged fashion of my countrymen by asking him another question, namely—When or where did I ever say that I expected him to call himself by either of these names? I cannot remember having said anything that even remotely implied this, and I do not therefore exactly see why he should appeal to my confused "Hibernian" judgment to decide such a question.

As he has done so, however, I reply that I think it unreasonable to expect a man to call himself anything unless and until good and sufficient reason has been given him

why he should do so. We are all of us bad judges as to what we are and as to what we should therefore be called. Other persons classify us according to what they know, or think they know, of our characters or opinions, sometimes correctly, sometimes incorrectly. And were I to find myself apparently incorrectly classified, as I very often do, I should be quite content with asking the person who had so classified me, first to define his terms, and next to show that these, as defined, were correctly applied to me. If he succeeded in doing this, I should accept his designation of me without hesitation, inasmuch as I should be sorry to call myself by a false name.

In this case, accordingly, if I might venture a suggestion to Professor Huxley, it would be that the term "infidel" is capable of definition, and that when Dr. Wace has defined it, if the professor accept his definition, it would remain for them to decide between them whether Professor Huxley's utterances do or do not bring him under the category of infidels, as so defined. Then, if it could be clearly proved that they do, from what I know of Professor Huxley's love of scientific accuracy and his courage and candor, I certainly should expect that he would call himself an infidel—and a miscreant, too, in the original and etymological sense of that unfortunate term, and that he would even glory in those titles. If they should not be so proved to be applicable, then I should hold it to be as unreasonable to expect him to call himself by such names as he, I suppose, would hold it to be to expect us Christians to admit, without better reason than he has yet given us, that Christianity is "the sorry stuff" which, with his "profoundly" moral readiness to say "unpleasant" things, he is pleased to say that it is.

There is another reference to myself, however, in the professor's article as to which I feel that he has a better right to appeal to me—or, rather, against me, to the readers of this review—and that is, as to my use, in my speech at the Manchester Congress, of the expression "cowardly agnosticism." I have not the report of my speech before me, and am writing, therefore, from memory; but my memory or the report must have played me sadly false if I am made to describe all agnostics as cowardly. A much slighter knowledge than I possess of Professor Huxley's writings would have certainly prevented my applying to all agnosticism or agnostics such an epithet.

What I intended to express, and what I think I did express by this phrase was, that there is an agnosticism which is cowardly.

And this I am convinced that there is, and that there is a great deal of it too, just now. There is an agnosticism which is simply the cowardly escaping from the pain and difficulty of contemplating and trying to solve the terrible problems of life by the help of the convenient phrase, "I don't know," which very often means "I don't care." "We don't know anything, don't you know, about these things." Professor Huxley, don't you know, says that we do not, and I agree with him. Let us split a B: and S."

There is, I fear, a very large amount of this kind of agnosticism among the more youthful professors of that philosophy, and indeed among a large number of easy-going, comfortable men of the world, as they call themselves, who find agnosticism a pleasant shelter from the trouble of thought and the pain of effort and self-denial. And if I remember rightly it was of such agnostics I was speaking when I described them as "chatterers in our clubs and drawing-rooms," and as "freethinkers who had yet to learn to think."

There is therefore in my opinion a cowardly agnosticism just as there is also a cowardly Christianity. A Christian who spends his whole life in the selfish aim of saving his own soul, and never troubles himself with trying to help to save other men, either from destruction in the next world or from pain and suffering here, is a cowardly Christian. The eremites of the early days of Christianity, who fled away from their place in the world where God had put them, to spend solitary and, as they thought, safer lives in the wilderness, were typical examples of such cowardice. But in saying that there is such a thing as a cowardly Christianity, I do not thereby allege that there is no Christianity which is not cowardly. Similarly, when I speak of a cowardly agnosticism, I do not thereby allege that there is no agnosticism which is not cowardly, or which may not be as fearless as Professor Huxley has always shown himself to be.

I hope that I have now satisfied the professor on the two points on which he has appealed to me. There is much in the other parts of his article which tempts me to reply. But I have a dislike to thrusting myself into other men's disputes, more especially when a combatant like Dr. Wace, so much more competent than myself, is in the field. I leave the professor in his hands, with the anticipation that he will succeed in showing him that a scientist dealing with questions of theology or biblical criticism may go quite as far astray as theologians often do in dealing with questions of science.

(To be continued.)

GOODLY WORDS.

Original translations from MEISTER ECKART, by C. H. A. Bjerregaard, Librarian, the Astor Library.

(Continued from page 250.)

(Mart. xxviii.) Learned people do not like that the soul be placed so near the Divine and attributed so much divine likeness. The reason of this is, that they do not know the nobility of the soul from the bottom off. If they knew it, they would not, on some points, make a distinction between the soul and God.

It is a wonder to me, and I have often pondered upon it, why the soul is not capable of speaking the Word as powerfully as the Heavenly Father. Some Masters say that the reason is this that that which is *essentially* in the Father is only in the soul as an *image*. I do not believe in such talk. If you take away the attributes of the soul, she is anyhow essentially like unto God. Other Masters say: that which God is, He is from Himself, but that which the soul possesses, she possesses as a gift, hence she cannot be like unto God in doings. I contradict this, too. The Son has also received from the Father, that which He is, yet He acts with the same power as the Father. He and the Father send forth the Holy Spirit with equal power and perfection. Hence this cannot be a hindrance to the soul.

There is, however, an other reason, to which I feel inclined to bow down. It is this, the Son has come forth out of the Father and has remained one with him, essentially; hence He is personally capable of the same as the Father, but the soul has come forth from the divine persons, and has not remained one with them, essentially. Yea, she has got a different, a strange existence; still, this has also come forth from out the Deity.

THE CHURCH. I.

"Which is the true Church, or the Gospel-Church, or the Church according to the new Covenant? A Church of inward Worshipers—of such as are inwardly holy—of such as offer inward Incense and Sacrifices—of inwardly redeemed ones, from the inward Egypt, from the inward Darkness and Power of Satan—a Church that hath the inward Ark, the inward Presence, the inward Manna."

"Which is the true Gospel-Ministry, and who are the true Gospel Ministers? Those whom Christ sends forth in the Spirit and Power of his Father to gather and build up this Church.—How can any minister Life unto the people, or build them up in the Life, Spirit and Power, but who are in the Life, Spirit and Power?—They are the Ministers of the Gospel, who have received that Spirit and Power wherein the Ministry of the Gospel stands. The Ministry of the Gospel is in the Light, Spirit, and Power of the most High, to turn peoples minds to a proportion of the same Light, Spirit and Power in themselves, and so to come to the manifestation and quickening of the same Life in themselves, that so they may walk in the same Light. O how precious is this Ministry!"

(From ISAAC PENINGTON'S *A Question to the Professors of Christianity*. London, 1680, pp. 150 and 210.)

THE CHURCH. II.

There was once a learned man who longed and prayed for eight years that God would show him one to teach him the Way of Truth. Once, while he thus longed and prayed there came to him a voice from Heaven, which said: "Go to the church door,

there you shall find a man to show you the Way of Blessedness."

So thither he went, and found a poor man whose feet were torn, and covered with dirt and dust, and whose clothing was worth scarcely three pennies. He greeted him, saying: "God give you a good morning." Thereat he answered: "I never had a bad morning." Again he said: "God prosper thee," to which the other replied: "I never had anything but prosperity." "Heaven save you, how do you answer me!" retorted the Scholar, but only to get this odd reply: "I was never other than saved."

"Explain this to me for I do not understand you." "Willingly," said the poor man. "You wish me a good morning. I never had a bad morning, for if I hunger, I praise God; if I am cold, or it hails, snows, rains; if the weather is fair or foul, I praise God—therefore I never had a bad morning. You say, God prosper thee. I have never been unprosperous, for I know how to live with God. I know that that which He does is the best, and what God ordaineth for me, be it pain or pleasure, that I take cheerfully from Him as the best of all—therefore have I no adversity. You wish that God would bless me. I was never unblessed, for I desire only to be in the Will of God, and I have so given up my will to the Will of God, that that which God will I will."

"But if God were to cast you into hell," said the Scholar, "what would you then do?"

"Cast me into hell? His goodness holds Him back therefrom. Yet if He did, I would have two arms to embrace Him withal. One arm is true Humility, and therewith am I one with His holy humanity. And with the right arm of Love, I would embrace Him, so that He must come with me into hell too. And even so, I would rather be in hell, and have God, than in heaven, and not have Him."

Then understood the Scholar that true abandonment, with utter abasement, was the nearest way to God.

The Scholar asked: "Whence comest thou?" and was answered: "From God."

"Where hast thou found God?"

"Where I abandoned all creatures! I am a king. My kingdom is my soul. All my powers, within and without, do homage to my soul. This kingdom is greater than any kingdom on the earth."

(This narrative is found in an appendix to TAULER'S *Medulla animæ*, but is usually attributed to ECKART.)

THERE are ten commandments hung on the walls of the Hindu Theological College in Madras. *Homeward Mail* reproduces them: (1) Pray to God as soon as you rise from your bed—5, 5.10 A.M. (2) Wash your body and keep your surroundings clean—5.10, 5.30 A.M. (3) Prostrate yourself before your parents or guardians, and take good exercise—5.30, 6.30 A.M. (4) Prepare well your school lesson—6.30, 9 A.M. (5) Attend school regularly and punctually, and do the school work properly. (6) Obey and respect your teachers and the teachers of the other classes, and other respectable persons. (7) Read till 8 P.M. at home. (8) Pray to God and go to bed—9 P.M. to 5 A.M. (9) Keep good company and avoid bad company. (10) Practice righteousness at all times.—*The Living Church*, January 11th, 1890.

I DON'T want to find out causes why God will save me, but I want to find out evidence that He has saved me.—*The Moravian, Bethlehem, Pa., January 8th, 1890.*

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE LILY AMONG THORNS. A study of the Biblical drama, entitled *The Song of Songs*. By WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS, D.D., Pastor of the Shawmut Congregational Church, Boston, Mass., and author of "*The Mikado's Empire*." Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1890 [1889]. 16mo, pp. viii., 274. \$1.25 and \$1.50 (handsomer binding).

This is one of the fruits of the great revival in Biblical study, and another proof that to the open eye wondrous things are shown in the Word of God. It is the product of a pastor, and has a certain homiletical atmosphere. It is also the product of a painstaking, fair-minded scholar, to whom facts count for more than fancies, and the text is higher in importance than the expositors. The book is very modern in spirit, not to say thoroughly American. It betrays its nationality on more than one page.

Dr. Griffis rejects *in toto* the allegorical and the mystical interpretations of the Song. He denies its alleged Solomonic origin, or that it was intended as an epithalamium for Solomon. On the contrary, he holds that the author was some Ephraimite or Northern Hebrew who lived about Solomon's time. He inclines to the view that the Song was suggested by the incident concerning Abishag, the beautiful maiden of Shunem, chosen to nurse David in his last days. He considers the Song a drama of five acts and fourteen scenes. Holding these views, he divides the text, which is that of the Revised English Bible, into acts and scenes, with appropriate headings, marginal references to the speakers, and what may be called stage directions.

But going somewhat into detail respecting this important volume, the following is the scheme of the book: Part I., History and criticism, in which he discusses in successive chapters the theory and interpretation of the Song; the life and times of King Solomon; the historic characters in the poem; its poetic background, dramatic structure and history as a book. Part II. is the text of the Revised Version, arranged according to his ideas; Part III. is "Studies and Comments," in which he pays attention to minute points as they come up, and gives piecemeal what is essentially a new translation of the entire book. It will be seen from this scheme that the book is not a commentary in the ordinary sense of that term.

"That love must rise spontaneously, and be true, is the supreme lesson of this divinely inspired drama" (p. 20). And surely such a lesson is worthy the Book of God. Those who seek in allegorical vaporizings and erotic fancies a justification of the presence of the book in the Bible, ignore the fact that pure love between the sexes is in itself worthy of treatment by the pen of inspiration. It is striking evidence of the difficulty of handling the subject that the Song, which is really chaste, should be, on the one hand, interpreted as an incentive to unchastity, and, on the other, considered as merely a vehicle for pious reflection or covert prophecy. Dr. Griffis shows how the book has been and still is regarded as impure. Few ministers preach upon it unless they allegorize it. But the latter course is uncalled for. It does violence to the poetic character of the Song. It certainly makes it teach what no Hebrew of the period would for a moment have supposed it taught.

And yet, when the correctness of Dr. Griffis's position is fully granted, one is dissatisfied with the absence of the spiritual element in this volume. It seems to me that the author might have given more of a Christian coloring to his interpretation. There is no reason why moral truth alone should have been conveyed. It was good and brave to insist, as he so often does, that the poem is pure, and that a poem on human love is worthy of a place in the canon; but it would have been proper and more to edification to bring out more prominently the idea that human love is a type of the divine. It is here the volume, which is so able, so full of appropriate learning, so interesting, so satisfactory in its exegesis on the whole, needs supplementing.

On a few minor points I think Dr. Griffis is mistaken. On pages 85, 86, he alludes to "the mimic stage play, the private theatricals of the children in the market-place (Matt. xi. 17), and that [Jesus] branded the Pharisees, the consummate mask-wearers of his day, as 'stage-actors'—that is, hypocrites." But were those children actors in any other sense than our own at play? Their games imitated scenes of mourning or mirth, but they were hardly plays. And the second remark loses its point if our Lord spoke Aramaic, and that, and not Greek, was almost certainly his tongue. On page 219 he makes the shepherd lover visit his beloved so perfumed that the latch is redolent with myrrh from his hands. But the text seems to teach that it was the Shulamite who had the myrrh, for it reads, as

quoted immediately below, "I rose to open to my beloved, and *my hands* dropped myrrh, and *my fingers* with liquid myrrh, upon the handles of the bolt." Is it Oriental to speak of the Shulamite's meeting her beloved "on the dear old *doorstep*" (p. 251) ? or as standing before the marriage altar and plighting her troth (p. 259) ?

Dr. Griffis has nothing good to say about Solomon. It is sad to find that so brilliant a character as he appears in legend and fancy cannot stand the test of critical examination. But we must give him up as an unworthy son of David, and mourn that one so gifted fell so low. Yet Dante puts him in heaven, and there we hope to find him.

There are many other points about this book of Dr. Griffis which I should like to dwell upon. I am confident that every reader will be pleased with the volume, and I trust the readers will be a multitude.

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON.

VISIONS AND NARRATIVES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By GEORGE EMLÉN HARE, D.D., LL.D. New York : E. P. Dutton & Co. 12mo, pp. 196. \$1.

This little volume contains a number of short papers on Old Testament subjects : The Origin of the Sabbath (Gen. i.-ii. 3) ; Sons of God and Daughters of Men (Gen. vi. 1-5) ; God Wrestling and Wrestled with (Gen. xxxii. 24-32) ; The Sense of Right and Wrong (Joseph's Brethren, Gen. xxvii., xlii.) ; Zion ; Micaiah the Son of Imlah (1 Kings xxii. 1-37) ; The Covenant with David (2 Sam. vii. 12-17) ; The Lord of David (Ps. cx.) ; Sufferings and Expectations (Ps. xxii.) ; The Servant of the Lord (Is. xl.-lxvi.) ; The Great Day of the Lord (Joel ii. 28-32) ; The Kingdom to be set up by God (Dan. ii., vii., ix.) ; Belshazzar (Dan. v.) ; The Messenger of the Covenant (Mal. iii. 1). Almost all of them apply or illustrate in some way the theory that the prophetic vision is the prevailing method of revelation. The recognition of this, the author believes, explains the peculiarities and removes the difficulties of prophecy. In Is. xiii.—e.g., the prophet foretells the taking of Babylon by Cyrus and the utter destruction of the city. There is no intimation that centuries should intervene between these two events. But the present total ruin of the city is the fulfilment of this prophecy, and accredits the other predictions of Isaiah. As he says in another connection, "A man standing on ground comparatively low may see in the prospect which presents itself mountain after mountain, one more distant than another, the second higher than the first, and

the third transcending the second. He may see them all, and yet fail to see and even fail to imagine the plains and fruitful fields that lie between the several ridges. Joel's vision of time may have been like such a man's vision of place." With the help of this hypothesis the author takes Ps. xxii., as well as ex., as direct prediction of the sufferings and reign of Christ. It is applied not only to prophecy, but to the narratives of the Old Testament. The account of creation in Gen. i. is to be explained as a vision of a symbolical character, something like a parable. It does not trench upon the sphere of science at all ; its scope is purely theological and religious. The account is, however, not in conflict with science, if it be rightly interpreted. There is nothing in it, for example, to compel us to think of the "days" as natural days of twenty-four hours ; on the contrary, Gen. ii. 5 shows that this cannot be intended. In other cases the author is inclined to allegorize, as when he writes of Jacob's wrestling : "The vision was a representation of Jacob's past and present, as seen from the Divine point of view." Under such a treatment, the historical character of revelation vanishes. And with it vanishes the possibility of understanding it, for vision and allegory have always been things of private interpretation, which we are assured Scripture is not. As a member of the American Committee, the author speaks a word for the use of the Revised Bible which I wish might be heeded.

GEORGE F. MOORE.

THE SERMON BIBLE. ISAIAH TO MALACHI. New York : A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway, 1890. 12mo, pp. 511. \$1.50.

Since of pulpit helps there is scarcely any end, every preacher should select and use the very best. To this class, in our judgment, belongs the book before us. It contains condensed sketches, and in some cases simply skeletons and outlines of sermons on very many of the principal texts in the prophetic books of the Bible. Some of these sketches were taken directly from the manuscripts of their authors, and hence represent sermons which nowhere else appear in print. The range of authorship is very wide. It includes many of the great living preachers, many recently deceased, and many of former generations. But though representing different shades of theological belief, they are all brought together here in a kind of picture gallery, and made to address their fellow-men on the momentous subjects of the Christian life. Many of these sketches are striking for their originality, their freshness,

and their suggestive qualities. Taken as a class they greatly exalt Christ, and bring out the lessons of God's providence in punishing sin and in rewarding righteousness. There are six sketches on the text: "Thine eyes shall see the King in His beauty; they shall behold the land that is very far off" (Is. xxxiii. 17); and three on the text: "A man of sorrows" (Is. liii. 3); and three on Dan. vi. 10. A striking feature of nearly all these sketches and outlines is their simplicity, their naturalness, their plain methods of inculcating sacred truth. This feature will be especially valuable to young ministers, who usually find it so hard to be simple and so difficult to address men from the pulpit in a straightforward and natural way. Another valuable feature of the book is its numerous references to sermons on other texts of each chapter. These constitute a kind of directory to the immense body of homiletic literature on the prophecies. But besides being a homiletical help to preachers, the volume will serve as a book of devotion for all classes of Christian readers.

J. W. RICHARD.

THE NICENE AND POST-NICENE FATHERS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. Edited by Dr. PHILIP SCHAFF. Vol. XIII. St. Chrysostom's Homilies. New York: Christian Literature Company. 8vo, cloth, pp. 599.

This is the thirteenth volume of the Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, and the twenty-third volume issued in connection with this noble undertaking by the Christian Literature Company. This volume appears in the fine style of the preceding volumes. It contains 599 pages, including a "Table of Contents," an excellent notice of St. Chrysostom as a homilist, by Dr. J. A. Broadus; "Additional Notes," clear, concise, comprehensive, by Dr. Gross Alexander, Professor of New Testament Greek in Vanderbilt University, Tenn., and a "Preface," short but significant, by J. H. Newman.

The *Argument* prefacing some sets of the homilies are finely stated by Chrysostom himself—e.g., the Homilies on Ephesians, on the First Epistle to Timothy, and on the Epistle to Philemon.

The book concludes with a complete Index of Subjects and a complete Index of Texts quoted.

Homilies, as is well known, are familiar addresses on certain passages of Scripture, more or less extended, imitated in the expository preaching of our day. In this direction perhaps Chrysostom excelled all the

preachers of earlier or later times. He was free, forcible, versatile in his handling; skilful, sympathetic, searching, practical in his applications. "Efflorescent and repetitious," but emphatic, he was attractive to the masses, while he was impressive and effective with all his hearers. Attracting all classes by his downright earnestness and eloquence, he swayed them as an ambassador for Christ with divine commission, as though God did beseech men through him to be reconciled to God (2 Cor. v. 18-20).

Dr. Broadus remarks: "The sympathetic student will soon find that Christianity is with Chrysostom a living reality. He dwells always in its presence and companionship. He is profoundly in earnest and all alive. In his homilies you see the frequent questions, the abrupt turns of phrase, the multiplied repetitions, by which a skilled and sympathetic preacher, keenly watching his audience, strives to retain attention and to insure a more general comprehension. You are drawn near to him, and almost stand by his side."

Upon the whole, of all the expository preachers, John of the Golden Mouth is our very best example. Of all the good models, ancient or modern, the attentive student can learn most from Chrysostom.

RANSOM BETHUNE WELCH.

AMONG CANNIBALS. An account of four years' travels in Australia and of camp life with the aborigines of Queensland. By CARL LUMHOLTZ, M.A., Member of the Royal Society of Sciences of Norway. Translated by Rasmus B. Anderson, ex-United States Minister to Denmark. With portrait, maps, 4 chromolithographs, and (123) woodcuts. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 8vo, pp. xx., 395. \$5.

The volume now before us is one that will have interest to several classes of readers. The naturalist will find here a record that will open some new pages for him in his specialty; the student of anthropology will find facts and material for thought; those who delight in books of travel will find here new scenes and strange tales; those who have read and had their sympathies aroused by the tale of the woes and wrongs of the aborigines of America, will find that such treatment has not been restricted to this country; and those who take interest in the matter of missions will find an account of a land where such labor is sadly needed. It were impossible, in the limits of a notice here, to more than indicate the points of interest as above. That is all that will be attempted. It may be added that the book

is well translated, and that the tale is told in such a way that interest does not flag. It comes to one with the attraction of novelty, and commands attention while it repays perusal.

The story is that of a man sent out by the University of Christiania, "with the object of making collections for the zoological and zootomical museums of the University, and of instituting researches into the customs and anthropology of the little-known tribes which inhabit" Australia. Central, Western, and Northern Queensland were the scenes of his travels. The volume contains an account of what was seen and learned, set down mainly as though in the form of a journal. In the form of an appendix there is a brief history of the continent, of its geology, flora and fauna. The maps are clear and well cut. The whole is completed with an excellent index, which adds materially to the value of the book.

C. R. GILLETT.

PROBLEMS IN AMERICAN SOCIETY: SOME SOCIAL STUDIES. By JOSEPH HENRY CROOKER. Boston: George H. Ellis. 16mo, pp. 293.

This volume is the product of a thoughtful Unitarian minister of Madison, Wis., who has gathered some excellent essays into a volume and given them a good running title. He has not attempted a continuous and thorough development of all the problems which are to be solved in American society, but mainly those which concern property, crime, education, economics, and religious co-operation. It would be too much to expect that all these essays should be equally fresh and instructive, but they are in each case the fruit of careful and independent thinking, and go down to the real issues that are involved in them. Mr. Crooker could not say anything new, though he says much which is suggestive concerning "The Student in American Life." His essay on this subject is simply helpful, not specially new in its thought. In discussing "Scientific Charity" he presents the history of organized charity since the beginning of the last century, and deals with the subject with great thoroughness and ability. We do not know where to look for a better monograph on this topic. The conclusion which he reaches is that the results of organized charity can rise no higher than the skill and zeal and fidelity of those charged with the care of these momentous interests. The essay on "The Root of the Temperance Problem" is one of the best in this little volume. What Mr. Crooker specially insists upon is the oft-

neglected truth that the larger and deeper work for temperance must ever be carried forward chiefly by other methods than those which belong to fanaticism and drastic effort, and that temperance reform ought never to be separated in theory or practice from the general progress of humanity. In the essay devoted to "The Political Conscience," Mr. Crooker is less happy than in other papers. In dealing with "Moral and Religious Instruction in our Public Schools," Mr. Crooker is treating a subject that is very near to his heart, and in his conviction that Church and State must be separated, and that they cannot unite in any overt way in the public school, is a candid and reasonable treatment of a great question; but the essay to which we attach most value in this volume is the one devoted to "The Religious Destitution of Villages." Here Mr. Crooker is dealing with a very live question, one that sends out its roots very deeply into American life, and one that is before us for immediate and constant treatment. The question behind the destitution of religion in American villages is one that is fundamental in American religious life. It is the question whether some method cannot be reached by which religious co-operation and intellectual freedom may not be united in one administration of spiritual affairs. Mr. Crooker urges his point with great plainness and with marked ability. He makes the plea that the Church shall recognize as its basis and its bond the love of God and man, no more and no less; he also urges that the work of the Church shall be human service, a ministry of mercy, and a method of social progress and amelioration. He says: "The religious destitution of villages will cease just as soon as the Church comes to recognize that its mission is to inspire men to do good rather than to enforce theological uniformity; just as soon as it appeals to men for their service and self-sacrifice in behalf of those in sin and in sorrow; just as soon as it makes it possible for men to co-operate for human progress, beside its altar, regardless of differences of opinion on theological subjects outside the limit of rational thought." This is very wholesome and stimulating teaching from a Unitarian clergyman; it has the right ring in it, and it is by the prevalence of such teaching as this that a higher and better spiritual life will come to pervade American society. Mr. Crooker has won his place and recognition in this volume as one who is working wisely and helpfully for the broader and better construction of American life.

JULIUS H. WARD.

THE SALT-CELLARS. Being a Collection of Proverbs, together with Homely Notes thereon. By C. H. SPURGEON. New York : A. C. Armstrong & Son. 12mo, pp. 367.

Mr. Spurgeon, if not the greatest of living preachers, is without doubt the most famous. This fame is his in part by his gifts as an orator, which would have won him equal fame at the bar or in Parliament, and in part by his faithfulness to the message that God has given him to declare. But there has been still another quality of his preaching to which his wide hearing is largely due—the quality of his style. No English orator of his day, save John Bright, has had the same mastery of vigorous Saxon English. His words go to the mark like a bullet, and strike with a force as deadly as the evils at which they are aimed. His style lends itself equally to scathing, blistering, overwhelming denunciation, and to the unsealing of the deepest fountains of love, pity, and penitence. Withal, it smacks of a racy wit, of a genial humor, and its sarcasms at times cut like a Damascus blade.

These characteristics appear with even greater plainness in some of Spurgeon's other works than in his sermons. In the character of "John Ploughman" he has written homely lectures to plain people, strongly reminding one in many ways of Franklin's "Poor Richard" and his saws, but excelling Franklin in being something more than the quintessence of shrewd, worldly wisdom. In these *Salt-Cellars* (the present volume being the second) he has worked the same vein, though perhaps not with equal success. The proverbs appear to be a compilation made on a principle more catholic than critical. "Three things," we are told on the title-page, "go to the making of a proverb—shortness, sense, and salt." The latter is sometimes present, if at all, in extreme homœopathic dilutions. The comments by Mr. Spurgeon, too, are often quite obvious, and neither assist one to the understanding of the proverb nor sharpen its suggestiveness.

It would be impossible, however, for any man, least of all for Mr. Spurgeon, to get together so many proverbs without making a notable assemblage of crisp sayings, most of them witty, many of them wise. There are few vices and foibles that are not here rebuked, few virtues that are not encouraged. It is the fashion with some moralists to sneer at proverbs as "copy-book morality," but we are not sure that it would not be well for our sons and daughters to have a

selection from these pages at the head of their copy-books—if anything so old-fashioned as a copy-book survives in our modern schools. At any rate, no one is so old, and few are so wise, that they will not be profited by a reading of this book. It may also have the effect of giving to contemners of the Bible a higher appreciation of Solomon's collection of Proverbs. It is on record that Dr. Wayland was once told by a conceited Brown student that Solomon's proverbs could not have been inspired—anybody could write such things. "Very well, young man," said the good doctor, "make a few." Here is a fair specimen of what the world has been able to make since Solomon's day, sayings in which are gathered "the wisdom of many and the wit of one." Let them be compared with those collected under divine inspiration, and however highly the former may be approved by a candid judgment, the latter will still outrank them.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

THE PATIENCE OF HOPE, AND OTHER SERMONS. By the late Rev. JOSEPH H. WRIGHT. With a brief sketch of his life. Edited by Oliver J. Thatcher. New York : Funk & Wagnalls, 1889. 12mo, pp. 224. Cloth, \$1.25.

In this volume Professor Thatcher, of the United Presbyterian Seminary at Allegheny, has rendered a filial tribute to his beloved pastor and friend. The sermons and the sketch of the writer are presented, as a memorial of his life, to his friends and former parishioners. The selection has been confined to fifteen sermons, and they are printed in their chronological order, ranging from the time when Mr. Wright was a student in the Union Seminary in New York to the time of his pastorate in Xenia, O. Some were prepared for special occasions, while others were preached in the ordinary course of Sabbath ministrations in his own pulpit. Among the former were : "The Call to the Ministry" (Eph. iv. 11), to the students of the Theological Seminary at Xenia ; "Truth" (Prov. xxiii. 23), to the Christian Union of Monmouth College, Illinois.

The sermons are eminently Biblical and evangelical. They show depth of conviction and earnestness of purpose, forming thus a fitting memorial of one well beloved by those with and for whom he labored. It was therefore wise to publish them, although, in the nature of things, they will have a contracted audience. Such sermons may be the means of implanting the divine life in others, though they be not great.

BIBLIOGRAPHY, NOTES AND MAGAZINES.

ANDREA, Jac. 20 Predigten aus den Jahren 1557, 1559, und 1560, zum 300. Jahrl. Gedächtnistag seines Todes den 7. Jan. 1890, wieder herausgegeben mit einem kurzen Lebensabriss Andrea's und dem Bericht seines Kollegen Heerbrand über sein Ende von Schmoller. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. viii., 400, 8vo, 5 mk.

ANTZE, Ad. Die Religion Jesu Christi, in den Formen der kirchl. Dogmatik, entwickelt und dargestellt. Braunschweig: Schwetschke. Pp. xii., 335, 8vo, 6 mk.

BAEUMKER. Das Problem der Materie in der griechischen Philosophie. Münster i. W.: Aschendorff. 8vo, 12 mk.

BELLOC, J. T. de. Le pays de Pharaons. Paris: Librairie de Paris, 1889. Pp. 416, 8vo, illust., 15 fr.

BESANT, Walter, and PALMER, E. H. Jerusalem: The City of Herod and Saladin. New edition, revised and enlarged. New York: Scribner & Welford, 1889. Map, cloth, 8vo, \$3.

BEZOLD, C. Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Konyunlik Collection of the British Museum. Vol. I. London: Longmans. Pp. xxxi., 420, 4to, 15s.

BOD, P. Historia Hungarorum Ecclesiastica, ed. L. W. E. Rauwenhoff. Vols. I. and II. Leiden: Brill. Pp. xvi., 477; vii., 436, 20 mk.

BOISSONNAS, G. De l'attitude de Jean-Baptiste en face de Jésus, d'après les données de évangiles synoptiques et du IVe évangile (Thèse). Paris: Libr. Leroux, 1889. Pp. 118, 8vo.

BON, Gustave C. (Chargé . . . d'une mission archéologique en Orient). Les premières civilisations (Egy. Assy. Judée. Phénice. Perse). Paris: Marpon & Flammarion, 1889. Pp. 800, 8vo, 443 gravures, 10 fr.

BOOTH, Maud B., Mrs. Beneath Two Flags: The Aim, Methods of Work, History, and Progress of the Salvation Army. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889. 12mo, cloth, \$1.

BRACE, Charles Loring. The Unknown God; or, Inspiration among Pre-Christian Races. New York: Armstrong. 8vo, cloth, \$2.50.

BRANDT, Sam., Prof. Ueber die dualistischen Zuspitze und die Kaiserreden bei Lactantius. Nebst einer Untersuchung über das Leben des Lactantius und die Entstehungsverhältnisse seiner Prosaschriften. Wien: Tempeky. Pp. 66 + 70, 8vo, 2.10 fl.

BRÜCK, H., Prof. Dr. Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert. Vol. II. Mainz: Kirchheim. Pp. xvii., 592, 8vo 7.60 mk.

BÜTTNER. Reisen in Kongoland. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1890. 8vo, 3 mk.

BUTEL, F. L'éducation des jésuites autrefois et aujourd'hui. Un collège breton. Paris: F. Didot, 1889. 8vo, 6 fr.

CAMPBELL, Wm. M. Footprints of Christ. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889. Pp. 375, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

CARPENTER, W. Boyd (Bishop of Ripon). The Permanent Elements of Religion; being the Bampton Lectures for 1887. London and New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. 148, 8vo, \$2.

CHIZEP, Ch., and PERROT, G. Le Temple de Jérusalem et la maison du Bois-Liban, restitués d'après Ezechiel et le livre des Rois. Ouvrage publié avec le concours de la Société des études juives, contenant 12 planches sur cuivre, 33 gravures, etc. Paris: Hachette, 1889. Folio, 100 fr.

THE SAME. Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité. Tome V. Phrygie, Lydie et Carie, Lucie, Perse. Paris: Hachette, 1889. 8vo, illust., 30 fr.

CHURCH, A. J., Rev., and SEELEY, Richmond. The Hammer: A Story of the Maccabees. London: Seeley & Co. Illust., cloth, 5s.

COLLINS, F. Howard. An Epitome of Herbert Spencer's Synthetic Philosophy. With a preface by Herbert Spencer. New York: Appleton. Pp. xviii., 576, 12mo, cloth, \$2.50.

DELARC. St. Grégoire VII. et la réforme de l'église au XIe siècle. Tome I. Paris: Retaux-Bray. Pp. xcix., 402.

DUBOIS, Friedrich. Das Buch der Religionen. Bearbeitet von —. 1 Lieferung. Stuttgart: Pfautsch, 1890. 8vo, 1 mk., 40 cts.

EBERS, Georg. Joshua: A Biblical Picture. Authorized edition. New York: Lovell, 1889. Pp. 267, 12mo, cloth, \$1; paper, 50 cts.

EGELHAAF, G., Prof. Deutsche Geschichte im XVI. Jahrhundert bis zum Augsburger Religionsfrieden (Zeitalter der Reformation). 1 Bd., 1517-1523. Stuttgart: Cotta. Pp. viii., 680, 8vo, 8 mk.

EINFÜHRUNG IN DIE HEILIGE SCHRIFT. Kurzfassete Zusammenstellung der wichtigsten Lehren aus der Einleitung in das Alte und Neue Testament, der bibl. Hermeneutik und Archäologie. Regensburg: Verlagsanstalt 1890. Pp. iv., 290, 8vo, 2 mk.

EMERSON, George H., D.D. The Bible and Modern Thought. Boston: Univ. Pub. House, 1890. Pp. 165, 12mo, cloth, 50 cts.

EVOLUTION: Popular Lectures and Discussions Before the Brooklyn Ethical Association. Boston: West, 1889. Pp. 400, 12mo, cloth, \$2.

EWEN, J., Rev. India: Sketches and Stories of Native Life. London: Elliot Stock. Crown 8vo, cloth, 4s. 6d.

FROST, J. M. Pædo-Baptism: Is it from Heaven or of Men? Philadelphia: American Baptist Publishing Society, 1889. Pp. 199, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

GOTTLOB, Adolf, Dr. Aus der Camera Apostolica des XV. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des päpstlichen Finanzwesens und des endenden Mittelalters. Innsbruck: Wagner. Pp. iii., 317, 8vo, 6 mk.

GUÉRIN, V. Jérusalem: Son histoire, sa description, ses établissements religieux. Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie., 1889. Pp. viii., 503, carte 8vo, 7.50 fr.

HAUCK, A. Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands. II., 1. Die fränkische Kirche als Reichskirche. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1889. Pp. 431, 8vo, 8 mk.

HODGKIN, Thomas, D.C.L. The Dynasty of Theodosius; or, Eighty Years' Struggle with the Barbarians. London: Clarendon Press. Crown 8vo, cloth, 6s.

HOYT, Wayland, D.D. Saturday Afternoon; or Conversations for the Culture of the Christian Life. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publishing Society, 1889. Pp. 302, cloth, \$1.

HUNOLT, Francis, Rev. Sermons. Vols. V., VI. The Penitent Christian; or, Sermons on the Virtue and Sacrament of Penance. New York: Benziger Bros., 1889. 8vo, cloth, net, \$5.

JOSEPHUS, F. Opera. Ed. et apparatus critico instructus B. Niese. Vol. V. . . . Contra Apionem lib. II. Berlin: Weidmann, 1889. 8vo, 5 mk.

JOSEPHUS, F. Works. Whiston's translation. Revised by the Rev. A. R. Shilleto. . . . New York: Scribner & Welford. 3 vols. (Bohn's Library.) 12mo, \$4.50.

KEHR, P. Die Urkunden Otto III. Innsbruck: Wagner. 7.60 mk.

KLEFFLER, H. Philosophie morale. La Conscience naturelle et la conscience religieuse. Geneva, 1889; Paris: Fischbacher. 12mo, 3 fr.

KOBLER, Andr. (S. J.). Katholisches Leben im Mittelalter. Bd. 4 (Schluss). Innsbruck: Vereinsbuchhandlung. Pp. viii., 940, 8vo, 9.60 mk.

LANGER, J. Das Buch Job in neuer und treuer Übersetzung nach der Vulgata. 3. Aufl. Das Hohelied nach seiner mystischen Erklärung (Eine Paraphrase). 2. Aufl. Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1889. Pp. xx., 219 and ix., 86, 8vo, 8 mk.

LAW, Thomas Graves (Librarian, Signet Library). An Historical Sketch of the Conflicts between Jesuits and Seculars in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, with a reprint of Christopher Bagehew's "True Relation of the Faction Begun at Wisbich," and illustrative documents. London: Natt. Pp. 324, 8vo, cloth, 15s.

LEFRANC, Abel. La jeunesse de Calvin. Paris: Fischbacher, 1888. Pp. xvi., 231, 8vo, 10 fr.

LUX MUNDI. A series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation. Edited by Charles Gore, M.A. London: John Murray; New York: Scribner & Welford, 1889. Pp. xxiii., 523, 8vo, cloth, \$5.60.

MARBACH. Die Psychologie des Firmianus Lactantius. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Psychologie. Halle a.S.: Pfeffer, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

MARTIN, J. P. P. Introduction à la critique générale de l'Ancien Testament. De l'origine du Pentateuque. Tome III. Paris: Maisonneuve, 40 fr.

METHODIST YEAR BOOK for 1890. Edited by W. H. DePuy. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1890. Pp. 90, 12mo, paper, 10 cts.

MONNERON, H. Le Sermon sur la montagne (Matt. v.-viii.). Etude pratique illustrée par des faits. Lausanne, 1889. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

MOULLE, H. C. G., Rev. Thoughts on Secret Prayer. London: Seeley & Co., 1889. Cloth, 1s.

MOZLEY, T., Rev. The Word. London: Longmans, Green & Co.; New York: Scribner & Welford, 1889. 12mo, cloth, \$2.50.

MUELLER, G. A. Christus bei Josephus Flavius. Innsbruck: Wagner, 1.60 mk.

NEHMIZ, H. Die Bethelligung der weiblichen Jugend an der kirchlichen Diakonie. Referat . . . 1889. Berlin: Wiegandt. Pp. 23, 8vo, 40 pf.

NITZSCH, F. Die Idee und die Stufen d. Opfercultus. Ein Beitrag zur allgemeinen Religionsgeschichte. Rektoratsrede. Kiel, 1 mk.

OETTINGEN, A. v. Zur Geschichte des Jenseits, mit einem Nachwort über Weltuntergang und jüngstes Gericht. Dorpat: Karow, 1889. Pp. 60, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

PAGE, W. M. New Light from Old Eclipses; or, Chronology Corrected and the Four Gospels Harmonized by the Rectification of Errors in the Received Astronomical Tables. Introduction by Rev. James H. Brookes, D.D. St. Louis: Barnes Publishing Co., 1890. Pp. xv., 590, 8vo, cloth, \$2.50.

PALGRAVE, Francis T. (Professor, Oxford). The Treasury of Sacred Song. Selected from the English lyrical poetry of four centuries, with notes explanatory and biographical. London: Clarendon Press, 1889. Post 8vo, half vellum, 10s. 6d.

PETER, P. A. History of the Reformation. Columbus, O.: Lutheran Book Concern, 1890. 16mo, cloth, 75 cts.

PIERSON, A. T., D.D. Keys to the Word; or, Helps to Bible Study. (New cheaper edition.) New York: Randolph & Co., 1889. Pp. xiv., 143, cloth, 50 cts.

PRENTICE, George. Wilbur Fisk. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 16mo, cloth, \$1.25.

PRICE, Jacob Embury, Rev. The Book Divine; or, How Do I Know the Bible is the Word of God? New York: Hunt & Eaton. 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

PURINTON, D. B. Christian Theism: Its Claims and Sanctions. New York: Putnam, 1889. Pp. vii., 303, 8vo, cloth, \$1.75.

PYNCHON, Thomas Ruggles, D.D. Bishop Butler: A religious philosopher for all time. A sketch of his life, with an examination of the "Analogy," with portrait. New York: Appleton, square crown 8vo, cloth, \$1.25.

RAWLINSON, George (Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford). The Story of Phœnicia. (Story of the Nations Series.) New York: Putnam's Sons, 1889. Pp. xvii., 356, illustrated 12mo, \$1.50.

RAWLINSON, George. The Kings of Israel and Judah. New York: Randolph. Pp. xii., 238, \$1.00.

RAYMOND, Grace. How They Kept the Faith: A Tale of the Huguenots of Languedoc. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 12mo, cloth.

READ, Lewis H. Believing and Doing. Sermons. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. Pp. 315, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

REDFORD, R. A. Vox Dei. The Doctrine of the Spirit as it is set forth in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. London: Nisbet, 1889. Pp. 342, 8vo, 6s.

RIBOT, Th. The Psychology of Attention. (Authorized translation.) Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1890. Pp. ii., 120, 12mo, 75 cts.

RIEKS, J. Lehre der zwölf Apostel. Urchristliches Lehr- und Erbauungs-buch für das christliche Haus aus dem Griech. übersetzt und erklärt. Berlin: Wiegandt, 1889. Pp. 43, 8vo, 50 pf.

RITSCHL, A. Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung. 1. Bd. Die Geschichte der Lehre. 3. Aufl. Bonn: Marcus, 1889. Pp. viii., 656, 8vo, 10 mk.

ROBINSON, Charles S., D.D. Simon Peter: His Early Life and Times. New York: American Tract Society, 1889. Pp. 309, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

ROMANCE of Psalms and Hymnal, Authors and Composers. New York: James Pott & Co. 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

SABATIER, A. De la vie intime des dogmes et de leur puissance d'évolution. Paris: Fischbacher. Pp. 26, Royal 8vo.

SADLER'S Catholic Directory, Almanac and Ordo for 1890. New York: Sadlier. 12mo, paper, \$1.25; cloth, \$1.50.

SAMPLE, Robert F., D.D. Beacon-lights of the Reformation; or, Romanism and the Reformers. With introduction by John Hall, D.D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, [1899]. Pp. vii., 432, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

SCHAEFER. Erklärung der zwei Briefe an die Theophrastus und des Briefes an die Galater. Münster i. W.: Aschendorff, 8vo, 5.40 mk.

SCHAFER, Philip, D.D., Prof., etc. Creed Revision in the Presbyterian Churches. New York: Scribners, 1890. Pp. vii., 67, 50 cts.

SEYRING, F. Die Abhängigkeit der Sprüche Salomons Cap. i.-ix. von Hiob auf Grund der Sprachlichen und Realen. Halle: Kämmerer, 1889. 80 cts.

SIMCOX, William Henry, M.A., Rev. The Language of the New Testament. (The Theological Educator Series, Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, Editor.) New York: Th. Whitaker. Pp. xii., 236, 12mo, 75 cts.

SIMONIN, A. H. Synthèse scientifique et philosophique. De l'unité rationnelle des croyances relativement aux notions et aux vérités universelles. Paris: Leroux, 12 mo, 1889, 4 fr.

SMITH, W. Robertson. Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. 1st Series: The Fundamental Institutions. Edinburgh: Black; New York: Appleton, 1889. Pp. 488, 8vo, 15s., \$4.00.

SOROF, Martin. Die Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte. Eine kritische Studie. Berlin: Nicolai's Verlag, 1890. Pp. 104, 8vo, 1.00 mk., 60 cts.

SPRENGER, Gustav. Darlegung der Grundsätze nach denen die syrische Übertragung der griechischen Geoponika gearbeitet worden ist. Eine von der philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Göttingen (1888) gekrönte Preisschrift. Leipzig: Dietrichs, 1890. Pp. 40, 4to, paper, 95 cts.

STAINER, Sir John. The Music of the Bible. With an account of the development of modern musical instruments from ancient types. New York: Novello, Ewer & Co. Cloth, \$1.00.

STALKER, James. Imago Christi: The Example of Jesus Christ. Introduction by William M. Taylor, D.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Pp. 332, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

STECKELMACHER, M. (Stadtrath). Die Gottesidee der Offenbarung und des Heidenthums, im Lichte eines neuen Untersuchungsmerkmals betrachtet. Eine religionsvergleichende Studie. Mannheim: Bensheimer, 1890. Pp. 102, 8vo, 2 mk., 75 cts.

STOKES, G. T., D.D. (Professor Ecclesiastical History, Dublin). Ireland and the Anglo-Norman Church. A history of Ireland and Irish Christianity from the Anglo-Norman conquest to the dawn of the Reformation. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1889. Crown 8vo, cloth, 9s.

SWETE, Henry Barclay, D.D. The Psalms in Greek according to the Septuagint. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. Cambridge (New York: Macmillan), 1889. Pp. xiv., 415, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

SWING, David. Motives of Life. New and enlarged edition. Chicago: A. C. McClurg. Pp. 239, 16mo, \$1.00.

TERTULLIANI, Qu. S. F. Opera ex recensione A. Reifferscheidt et G. Wissowa. Pars I. (Corp. Scrip. Eccl. Lat. xx. 1.) Wien: Tempelky, 1890. Pp. xv., 396, 8vo, 15.00 mk.

THOMASius, Gottfried (Professor Theology). Die christliche Dogmengeschichte als Entwicklungsgeschichte des kirchlichen Lehrbegriffs. 2. Aufl. nach des Verfassers Tode herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Bonwetsch und Seeberg. (Bd. I., 9 mk.; II., I., 5 mk.) Bd. II., II. Erlangen & Leipzig: Böhme, 8vo, 8 mk.

TIEFENTHAL, O. S. B., Professor (Einsiedeln). Das Hobe Lied. Ausgelegt für Theologiestudierende und Theologen. Kempten: Kösel. Pp. 364, 8vo, 4.50 mk.

TURNER, F. S. The Quakers: A Study, Historical and Critical. London: Sonnenschein, 1889. Pp. 406, 8vo, 6s.

UNITARIANISM. Its Origin and History: A Course of Sixteen Lectures delivered in Channing Hall, Boston, 1888-1889. Boston: Am. Unitarian Association, 1890. Pp. xxvii., 304, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

VERNES, Maurice. *Precis d'histoire Juive depuis les origines jusqu'à l'époque Persane.* V. siècle avant J.-C. Paris: Librairie Hachette & Cie, 1889. Pp. 828.

WACKER, E. *Der Diakonissenberuf nach seiner Vergangenheit und Gegenwart.* Kurz dargestellt. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. iv., 211, 8vo, 2 mk.

WAKLEY, J. B., D.D. *Lost Chapters Recovered from the Early History of Methodism.* With a memoir of the author by the Rev. William E. Ketcham. New York: Wilbur E. Ketcham. Pp. 640, illustrated, cloth, \$2.00.

WALBURG, Rev. A. H. *The Question of Nationality in its Relations to the Catholic Church in the United States.* St. Louis: Herder, 1889. 12mo, paper, net, 25 cts.

WARD, C. Osborne. *A History of the Ancient Working People from the Earliest Known Period to the Adoption of Christianity by Constantine.* Washington, D. C.: W. H. Lowdermilk, 1890. Pp. 519, cloth, \$2.00.

WARD, Julius H. *The Church in Modern Society.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 16mo, \$1.00.

WARNECK, G., Dr. *Die Stellung der evangelischen Mission zur Sklavenerfrage, geschichtlich und theologisch erörtert.* Gütersloh: Bertelsmann. Pp. 123, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

WATERICH, Prof. *Das Passah des neuen Bundes. Eine theologische Betrachtung.* Baden-Baden: Sommermeyr, 1889. Pp. viii., 120, 8vo, \$1.10.

WEISS, N. *La chambre ardente: étude sur la liberté de conscience en France sous François I. et Henri II. (1549-1559).* Paris: Fischerbacher, 6 fr.

WEISS, Hermann. *Einführung in die christliche Ethik.* Freiburg i. B.: Mohr, 1889. Pp. viii., 239, 8vo, 5 mk.

WELHAUSEN, J. *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten.* 4. Heft. (1) Medina vor dem Islam. (2) Muhammad's Gemeindegemeinschaften von Medina. (3) Seine Schreiben und die Gesandtschaften an ihn. Berlin: Reimer. Pp. 194 + 73 of Arabic text, 8vo, 9 mk.

WESTCOTT, Brooke Foss, D.D., D.C.L. *The Epistle to the Hebrews.* The Greek text, with notes and essays. New York: Macmillan, 8vo, \$4.

WHITE, Edward (Archbishop of Canterbury). *Christ and His Times.* Addressed to the diocese of Canterbury in his second visitation. London and New York: Macmillan, 1890, crown 8vo, 6s.

WHITON, James Morris, Ph.D. *New Points to Old Texts.* New York: Whitaker, 1890. Pp. 255, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

WINDELBAND, W. (Professor, Strassburg). *Geschichte der Philosophie.* 1. Lieferung. Freiburg i. B.: Mohr, 1890. Pp. 1-128, 8vo, 95 cts.

WOLFF, J., Prof. Dr. *Das Bewusstsein und sein Object.* Berlin: Mayer & Müller. Pp. xi., 620, 8vo, 12 mk.

WOLF, Edmund Jacob, D.D. *The Lutherans in America.* A story of struggle, progress, influence and marvellous growth. With an Introduction by Henry R. Jacobs, D.D. New York: J. A. Hill & Co. Pp. xx., 644, \$2.75.

WOOLNY, F., Dr. *Prolegomena der natürlichen Moral.* Leipzig: Wigand. Pp. 48, 8vo, 1 mk.

WORKMAN, George Coulson, Rev. (Professor O. T. Exegesis, Victoria University, Coburg, Ont., Canada). *The Text of Jeremiah; or, A Critical Investigation of the Greek and Hebrew, with the variations of the LXX, retranslated into the original and explained, with an introductory notice by Professor Franz Delitzsch, D.D.* New York: Scribner & Welford, 1889, 8vo.

WRIGHT, Joseph H., Rev. *The Patience of Hope, and Other Sermons.* With a brief sketch of his life. Edited by Oliver J. Thatcher. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889. Pp. 224, 12mo, \$1.25.

ZIMMERN, H. *Die Assyriologie als Hilfswissenschaft für das Studium des Alten Testaments und des klassischen Altertums.* Antritts-Vorlesung. . . Königsberg i. Pr., November 1, 1889. Königsberg: Koch, 1889. Pp. 22, 8vo, 25 cts.

ZÖCKLER, Otto (Hrsg.). *Handbuch der theol. Wissenschaften in encykl. Darstellung.* 3. Aufl. Bd. 4, Praktische Theol. München: Beck. Pp. viii., 660, 8vo, 10 mk.

The Editor of the *CONCISE DICTIONARY OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE* returns his thanks to the correspondent who kindly pointed out the typographical error on p. 127, col. 1, l. 33; r. Lyne for Lynn.

HARPER's for February opens with an article on "The Standing Army of Great Britain," by General Viscount Wolsey, in which it is said that Cromwell's invading army of about 80,000 men was by far "the finest in every respect that we know of in modern history." There is a spirited picture of Cromwell at Marston Moor. The illustrations are particularly good. The present British army numbers 211,307. The article on Benvenuto Cellini will interest a different class. For his "Peregrine," his masterpiece, he received only 3500 crowns, whereas it was estimated to be worth 16,000. "Jamaica, New and Old," by Howard Pyle, is a continuation of that in the January number. "The Lake Dwellers," by S. H. M. Byers, does full justice to Professor Ferdinand Keller, to whom we are indebted for our knowledge of those pre-historic folk. The illustrations include a portrait of Keller, an ideal view of a lake village and pictures of many implements, etc. The lake villages existed on all the Swiss lakes, but they left no written history. Mr. George Parsons Lathrop recounts some of his "Talks with Edison," in which we learn much about Mr. Edison's early life. The invention which cost him most study and experimentation was the electric light. He said once, "The existence of an intelligent Creator, a personal God, can, to my mind, almost be proved from chemistry." Mark Twain dwells characteristically upon "A Majestic Literary Fossil"—Dr. James' *Dictionary of Medicine*, published in London in 1745. "Nights and Days with De Quincey," by James Hogg, is a timely article in view of the new edition of De Quincey now appearing. Everything relating to that remarkable man is welcome, and Mr. Hogg helps us understand him, as only he can who knew De Quincey personally and intimately. Mr. Richard Wheatley has an article on "New York Banks." The other departments of this uniformly excellent magazine present their usual variety. Mr. Curtis, in the Easy Chair, has a bright little essay on the Shakers.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for February is filled with interesting matter. Those who have followed Dr. Holmes through his literary career—and what lover of literature has not?—will read with delight his third paper in the "Over the Teacups" series, in which he demonstrates with characteristic wit, the moral fallacies of Mr. Bellamy's theories. Francis A. Walker combats these theories also in an article entitled "Mr. Bellamy and the New Nationalist Party." Charles B. Elliott discusses the Fishery question: Mr. K. Kaneko, the hero of the Japanese Commission which has been visiting this country, contributes a paper on "An Outline of the Japanese Constitution;" Mr. Lowell's book on Isaac Walton is reviewed; and Mr. John T. Morse treats Davis's "Recollections of Mississippi" under the title "One of the Unconstructed." Henry James, Margaret Deland and Mr. Bynner contribute fiction in instalments; and there are the usual poems, reviews (including a valuable one on "Browning's Energy") and racy talk in the "Contributor's Club" columns.

LIPPINCOTT's for February opens with a novel by A. Conan Doyle, "The Sign of the Four;" Julian Hawthorne contributes his second paper on "Nathaniel Hawthorne's 'Ellixir of Life,'" describing the method of his father's work, and incidentally rectifying much of his original writings subsequently changed for publication; and there are articles by Francis Galton, F.R.S., C. H. Herford, A. E. Watrous, John Habberton and others; with book reviews (in which department this magazine is exceptionally strong) by William S. Walsh, Melville Phillips, Maurice F. Egan, Charles Morris, and H. C. Walsh.

The biographer of the late John Ericsson, Colonel W. C. Church, contributes the first of two illustrated articles on the great engineer to the February SCRIBNER, which is an unusually interesting number even of this always interesting magazine. W. H. Mallock writes an article on Hungarian castles. Herbert Ward has a paper entitled "Life Among the Congo Savages," curiously illustrated, and of value as affording a comprehensive description of the manners and customs of the strange people found by Stanley in his march into the African interior. William Henry Bishop and Eugene Schuyler are contributors to this number, and President Wright, of Oberlin, writes a geological monograph. T. R. Sullivan has one of his remarkable short stories, entitled "Through the Gate of Dreams."

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD for February opens with an excellent article by Rev. James Johnston, of London, "Protestant Missions a Hundred Years Ago and Now." Next comes an account of Dr. Pierson's missionary crusade in Scotland, which is followed by Rev. Dr. Bradford's article, out of place in this magazine, on the charities of Germany. But the most valuable article is on "The Jubilee of the New Hebrides Mission," by Rev. Dr. Robert Steel, of Sydney, New South Wales. It contains sketches of the heroes of this mission. Rev. J. Hudson Taylor calls once more for help in the inland mission in China; Rev. Secretary Dr. Ellinwood shows up the credulity of scepticism. Rev. Paul de Schweinitz, etc. tells of the Moravian mission on the Kukokwim in Alaska, and shows that "missionary heroism has not yet gone out of date." Mr. Starbuck gives his able condensed translations of the foreign missionary journals. This is one of the most interesting features of the Review. The other departments are filled as usual.